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INTRODUCTION

The New Deal was inevitable in the United States in some form. For several generations, Europe had been moving steadily ahead in the adjustment of governmental function to the changing needs of society. But the United States had been comparatively slow to accept this trend which industrialization, concentration of population, and a growing humanitarianism had brought. She had built her freedom upon a strong individualism; she had needed few social controls, for her boundaries had been wide; and sectional attitudes toward political problems still conflicted with material interests.

In the last decade of the nineteenth century, however, a political revolution began to take more definite shape and direction in the United States. A growing social consciousness emerged into national politics with Theodore Roosevelt's war on the trusts; Taft fought combination of power more effectively, if less spectacularly, than his predecessor; Wilson championed individual freedom and free enterprise until World War I engaged his efforts and those of the nation. In the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover administrations, the gains made in this struggle with monopoly were swallowed up, first by prosperity and then by depression.
Thus, Franklin D. Roosevelt felt, in 1933 when he came to the Presidency, that he was picking up the torch from Woodrow Wilson to carry on the fight for the rights of the individual within the complex framework of the new industrial civilization.

The whirl of activities upon which the nation set out in 1933 to defeat the depression needs no review. Action followed on many fronts at the same time, with inconsistencies and contradictions and with complete reversals of position on some problems. That the United States had forged toward recovery, there was no doubt, however, in the summer of 1936. Breathing, thus, a little more easily the nation began to take a backward look at the paths by which it had come and the efforts it had made, and to chart its course for the years to follow. At this point stood the Presidential campaign of 1936.

National conventions of the two major parties were held in June, the Republicans meeting in Cleveland on June 9, and the Democrats gathering in Philadelphia on June 23. Liberalizing influences within and without the Republican party brought the nomination to Alfred M. Landon, governor of Kansas. The Democrats had no other thought in mind than to reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt, who had led the country out of depression.
When the student of history seeks to understand the verdict of the people on November 3, 1936, he will find invaluable assistance in analyzing the speech-making of the campaign. The opening assaults of the Republican orators were so vigorous that the Democrats began their active campaign fully a month earlier than had been their intention. Not so the President himself: he had drawn the lines of the campaign clash militantly in his acceptance address on June 27; then he made a "non-political" tour to the South, and a "non-political" "journey of husbandry" to the Midwest—a President active in the service of his people, but, naturally, gathering votes at every rear-platform talk and every WPA project visit.

On September 29, in Syracuse before the New York State Democratic Convention, however, the President opened his campaign with an attack on the communism issue. And in the month to follow he conducted a stump-speaking campaign that the historian may well consider. Having struck at monopoly with his Philadelphia address and at Communism with his Syracuse speech, he now added five major blows at problems agitating the voters. Roosevelt discussed the balancing of the budget in an address in Pittsburgh on October 1. He travelled to the Midwest to discuss the farmers' problem in Omaha on October 10. He explained the government's attitude toward small business in his
speech in Chicago on October 14. Taxation was his theme in Worcester, Massachusetts, on October 21; and the whole question of economic freedom was his province in the final speech at Madison Square Garden on October 31.

To what extent did the well-remembered verdict of November 3 depend upon these seven efforts at reaching the public mind through speaking? Did Roosevelt's 40,000 words spoken in major addresses between the Syracuse address and the election weigh more in the decision than Landon's similar number?1 If so, then in what did they excel, and were the words the differentiating factor? Or the voice, as is so frequently said? Did Roosevelt's speaking in the campaign of 1936 contribute significantly to his reelection on November 3?

These questions lie within the field of rhetorical investigation. To the rhetorical critic the student of history may turn for a reasoned answer as to the power of Roosevelt's speechmaking in the total picture of a nation making up its mind on vital issues. The critic, will, therefore, attempt to assess the interplay of speaker, audience, subject and occasion; he will keep in mind that

---

1Each used about 40,000 words from the first of October to the election date. New York Times, November 1, 1936.
the response achieved is the measure of success and will evaluate the speech in the whole pattern of the political effort of which it was a part. None such reasoned answer

Such a reasoned answer would be given by rhetorical criticism which "reconstructs a speech situation with fidelity to fact; it examines this situation carefully in the light of the interaction of speaker, audience, subject, and occasion; it interprets the data with an eye to determining the effect of the speech; it formulates a judgment in the light of the philosophical-historical-logical constituents of the inquiry; and it appraises the entire event by assigning it comparative rank in the total enterprise of speaking." Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism, The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1945, p. 18.

has yet been attempted in regard to the speech-making of President Roosevelt in the 1936 campaign. Thus, an inves-

Gladys Hoffman analyzed the method by which the subject was developed for stimulating and convincing the audience in 19 speeches by Landon and 11 by Roosevelt in the 1936 campaign. Her emphasis was placed upon the use of stereotypes, class appeals, special devices for gaining interest and for persuasive effect. She did not attempt to reconstruct the social setting in which these addresses were given or to assess the interplay of forms of proof. Such a general study must be supplemented by an investigation which takes into account these other vital factors. Gladys L. Hoffman, An Analysis of the Major Campaign Speeches of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Landon in the 1932 Election. (M. Ph. Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1937)

Investigation of the audience persuasion of Franklin D. Roosevelt in his first campaign for reelection is in order, not only for the intrinsic interest of the speech-making itself
but particularly for the part it would play in throwing into clearer light one small segment of the American scene. It is the purpose of this investigator to strive for such a reasoned view.

**Authentication of Texts**

Such a study should be based upon an analysis of the actual speeches delivered on these occasions. Texts available in published form\(^4\) cannot be considered free from their editing. This investigator, therefore, checked these texts with the stenographic accounts of Henry M. Kannee, official reporter, which are on file at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library in Hyde Park, New York. Two of the addresses, those at Philadelphia, Pa., and at Madison Square Garden, were available at the National Archives in Washington, D. C., in the form of electrical transcriptions of Roosevelt's speaking. It was thus discovered that the stenographic reports were not completely accurate, and the investigator secured recordings of the other five addresses. One, the Syracuse address, was obtained from the Audio-Scriptions, Inc.; four others, the addresses at Pittsburgh,
Omaha, Chicago and Worcester, were recorded by the National Broadcasting Company from their master records. In addition, the investigator obtained transcriptions of

At the request of Representative Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota, the National Archives made transcriptions for this writer.

the two which she had heard at the National Archives. Thus, it was possible to study not only the words uttered by the President in this campaign but the aspects of his voice as well. Each text used in this investigation has thus been authenticated from the actual voice of Roosevelt, heard through electrical transcriptions.

Mechanical errors in the transcriptions have made reliance upon the stenographic copy text necessary in three instances. In the Syracuse address the omission of one passage and several small phrases has forced the investigator to rely upon Mr. Kannee's reports at these points. The Chicago speech has the last two pages from this stenographic source. In the Madison Square Garden address the omission of a short paragraph in the master recording at the National Archives and, consequently, in the copy obtained by the investigator has made the use of the stenographic account necessary. That these omissions are results of mechanical error is verified not only by the sentence-fragments that they cause in the transcriptions but also because Mr. Kannee's copies in the Hyde Park Library, in all cases, indicate in these paragraphs the points at which the audience applauded.
Procedure

This investigator proposes to analyze the audience persuasion achieved in these seven major addresses of the 1936 campaign. Persuasion refers to the winning or strengthening of belief in the speaker's line of advocacy.7

7Ewbank and Auer have put it thus: "Persuasion, then, is the process of securing acceptance of an idea, or a course of action..." Henry L. Ewbank and J. Jeffrey Auer, Discussion and Debate, F. S. Crofts & Co., New York, 1941, p. 261.

The devices of such achievement are the proofs struck out by Aristotle in his designation of logical, ethical and pathetic proofs.8 No separate summation of each of these

8The Rhetoric presented this explanation: "Of the means of persuasion supplied by the speech itself there are three kinds. The first kind reside in the character of the speaker (ethos); the second consist in producing a certain (the right) attitude in the hearer; the third appertain to the argument proper, in so far as it actually or seemingly demonstrates..." Lane Cooper, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1932, p. 8.

appeals for an entire speech is planned for this study, because the three types are held to be interdependent in their effect, to be conditioned by the presence or absence of other types. Analysis of the logical formulation of an idea gives little evaluation of its impact upon the audience because the power of this logic is conditioned
by the ethical and the pathetic elements operative at the time of presentation.\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{9}Baker and Huntington have pointed out: "While the presentation of sound argument is a very important part of winning belief, we have to consider most the emotional phases of the process; because, first, emotion has much to do with determining what are good arguments—that is, what considerations are important—and, secondly, because the soundest of reasoning will not avail if the attitude of the listener is set against the speaker or his conclusion." George P. Baker and H. B. Huntington, \textit{Principles of Argumentation}, Boston, Ginn and Co., 1905, p. 331.

Again, a pathetic appeal which plays effectively upon deep-seated emotions and attitudes generates by its very success a greater ethical appeal.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{10}Charles Bird, \textit{Social Psychology}, D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1940, p. 377: "The persuasive leader wins confidence through releasing and directing aspirations largely by means of emotional appeals and because he envisages goals with greater precision than most of his followers."

And this respect of the audience for the "intelligence, character, and good will,"\textsuperscript{11} of the speaker in its turn conditions the reception of the pathetic and logical appeals.\textsuperscript{12} It is pertinent to remember that "we tend
Quintilian speaks of a manner that is "ingratiating and courteous and such as to excite pleasure and affection in our hearers..." H. E. Butler, The Institutes of Oratory of Quintilian, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1931, Vol. II, p. 425.

to believe what we wish to believe.\footnote{Ewbank and Auer, op. cit., p. 60.}

The interrelated nature of these means of proof has determined the plan of analysis. Each major idea of the speech under consideration has been examined as to logical, ethical and pathetic forms of proof viewed individually, but the emphasis has been placed upon their interaction rather than upon their summation.

In the examination of the logical structure, the idea has been gauged as to its correctness of reasoning, the general acceptability of its premises and the historical authenticity of its data. An examination of the political, economic, social and psychological climate in which the speech was presented; appraisal of the audience from whom the response was to be won; description of the circumstances immediately before and after the speech because of their conditioning effect upon the audience and the speaker; and analysis of the
speaker's methods of relating his ideas to the basic drives and attitudes of the audience through the choice of ideas, the selection of words, phrases and sentence-forms, and the adaptation of voice to purpose. The examination of ethical appeals will seek to determine how these procedures are used in giving evidence (from the audience's point of view) as to the speaker's believability. Such an analysis of individual factors cannot be neglected although the succeeding interpretation is to depend upon their interaction rather than upon their separate presence.

The analysis of persuasion in each speech will, thus, take the following form:

(1) **The background:** a reconstruction of the political, economic, social and psychological factors of the speech occasion;

(2) **The audience:** an analysis of the composition of the audience and of their attitudes and beliefs;

(3) **The immediate setting of the speech:** a study of the physical setting, of activities preceding the speech, of the speaker's own preparation, attitude and alleged purposes;

(4) **The speech:** an analysis of the ideas as to their validity and the power they assume through logical, ethical
and pathetic proofs; through arrangement, through language and delivery;

(5) **Summary and Interpretation**: a synthesis of the usage of the four elements: ideas and proofs, arrangement, language and delivery;

(6) **The Reactions to the Speech**: interpretation of the stature of the speech through analysis of contemporary newspaper and other reports and speeches.

Out of these judgments on the separate addresses will arise an interpretation of the effectiveness of Roosevelt's campaign speaking of 1936.
Chapter I

THE ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS AT FRANKLIN FIELD,
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA, JUNE 27, 1936

The Background

Over three years had passed since Franklin D. Roosevelt had accepted the people's mandate to do something about the depression and had restored public confidence quickly\(^1\) by his courage and his swift action in the banking crisis. Then he had struck immediately at the farmers' distress and at the problem of unemployment. He had expected that employment, production and purchasing power would keep pace with the increased prices which he cooperated with business to encourage. Drought in 1934, dissatisfaction with the farm program, disillusionment with the National Recovery Act--such factors brought the danger of a new depression; the administration had countered with a series of stimulants for the economic system. Nevertheless, the President had claimed little accomplishment in his

\(^1\)"The confidence for which Hoover had pleaded for three years had been restored within two weeks by Roosevelt."
Annual Message of January 4, 1935, and had launched a

"Materially, I can report to you substantial benefits to our agricultural population, increased industrial activity, and profits to our merchants. Of equal moment, there is evident a restoration of that spirit of confidence and faith which marks the American character." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, compiled by Samuel I. Rosenman, Random House, New York, 1938, Vol. IV, p. 15.

security program which turned from cooperation with business to strenuous efforts for increasing the purchasing power of the masses more directly than before. The 1935 session of Congress had passed important liberal measures, but before adjournment had taken place the Supreme Court had declared unconstitutional four acts basic to the program of the New Deal.

The problem of unemployment had not been conquered in the fall of 1935 but the President spoke of

"employment increases" in his address to Congress on
January 3, 1936. For this and other problems he asked Congress to unite in meeting the challenges of "entrenched greed." This was a declaration of war on "big business" and was especially vigorous in its claims that an "economic autocracy" would use the "new instruments of public power" to enslave the public. The issue was fairly joined when Alfred Smith and Herbert Hoover spoke in answer to the President's message. Smith brought the charge that Communism was being substituted for representative government by the President's actions and Hoover claimed that

"This country was organized on the principles of a representative democracy, and you can't mix socialism or Communism with that. They are like oil and water. They are just like oil and water, they refuse to mix."

"Incidentally, let me say to you that is the reason why the United States Supreme Court is working overtime, throwing the alphabet out of the window, three letters at a time."

"I am going to let you in on something else. How do you suppose all this happened. The young brain trusters caught the Socialists in swimming and they ran away with their clothes...."

"There can be only one atmosphere of government, the clear, pure, fresh air of free America, or the foul breath of communistic Russia. There can be only one flag, the Stars and Stripes, or the flag of the godless Union of the Soviets...."
"There can be only one victor. If the Constitution wins, we win...."

Note: Alfred E. Smith was speaking before the American Liberty League in Washington, D.C., on January 25, 1936. Vital Speeches, 2: 285-286, February 10, 1936, "Peripatetics"

the epithet of "entrenched greed" was fostering division among the classes in America. 8

8...that has points in confusing the public mind. Any judge of debate would admit it. It has merit as a call to class war, a red herring across the trail of failure, an implication that all opponents are defenders of evil, a claim that righteousness now has refuge alone in Washington, and an avoidance of facts and figures."

Note: Herbert Hoover was speaking at Portland, Oregon, on February 12, 1936. This speech was but one of the series made in 1935-1936 on the administration by the ex-President. Vital Speeches, 2: 33, February 24, 1936, "The Towers of Babel."

In March Colonel Henry Breckinridge, Assistant Secretary of War from 1913 to 1916, tied up the difficult unemployment problem directly with the administration's policy of scarcity 9 formerly established by the

9"The estimates I have seen conclude that the jobs of two and one half million minimum and three million one hundred thousand maximum have been directly destroyed by Wallace's and Tugwell's economy of scarcity. It is highly probable that the economic folly of Government during the last three years is directly responsible for a third and perhaps a half of the existing unemployment."

Note: Breckinridge was speaking at a dinner of the Association for the Defense of the Constitution at Baltimore, Maryland, on March 4, 1936. Vital Speeches, 2: 389, March 23, 1936, "The Valley of Decision."
Agricultural Adjustment Act and later approached less directly by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (approved on February 29, 1936).

The President's Budget Message of January 3, 1936, had declared without the relief item the budget was in balance. However, the Supreme Court's invalidation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and Congress's enactment of the bonus law had changed the picture and in a supplemental budget message on March 3, 1936, the President proposed a tax on undistributed corporate income. And in a message to Congress on March 18 he asked for the relief appropriation he felt to be necessary and added:

"I propose, therefore, that we ask private business to extend its operations so as to absorb an increasing number of the unemployed."  

His request to Congress was successful but his suggestion to business was met with opposition. Mr. C. M. Chester, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, expressed the general feeling among business men
that industry was being called upon to solve the problem of unemployment by absorbing more workers and at the same time was being hindered by governmental action from achieving this result. He pointed to political threats which frightened capital from investment, labor legislation which encouraged disputes, campaign publicity which weakened confidence in industry, taxes which prevented expansion and replacement, and investigations which wasted time and energy. He declared:

"The major problem of unemployment will never be solved by misunderstandings and recriminations. Temporary political success may be gained by unjust indictment of industrial accomplishment. But we are a fair-minded people and in the end the truth will prevail."12


Mr. Lewis H. Brown, president of the Johns-Mansville Corporation, told the Chamber of Commerce of the United States meeting in Washington, D.C., April 28, 1936, that there were two essentials of recovery: Approval of the profit motive, and legitimate use of Federal taxation. He pointed out that

"...it is also the conviction of over 90% of the business men of this country that some of the Government policies that have been followed are unsympathetic to the encouragement of business and that these policies are definitely preventing reemployment."13
The tax act signed on June 22, 1936, substantially followed the suggestions of the President. The Undistributed profits tax on corporations angered the businessmen who felt that it was a punitive measure. Both this act and the Price Discrimination Act on June 20 aided small enterprises and showed the administration's desire to strengthen small business.

The hopes of organized labor, raised to new heights by the promises of the National Industrial Act but somewhat discouraged by the administration's attempts to appease business before 1935, were increased again by the Wagner Labor Relations Act and the Social Security Act.

Recovery had come before the convention—month of June, 1936. The upswing of business\textsuperscript{14} was both cause and result of the consumer's improved condition. More goods were produced and there was more purchasing power to absorb them. The consumer was in approximately the same position in regard to the purchase of goods as he had been

\textsuperscript{13}Vital Speeches, 2: 484-485, May 4, 1936, "Industry."

\textsuperscript{14}Dividends in industry, including agriculture and mining, were $4,861,000,000 in 1936, the highest since 1930. Table 54, National Income and Its Composition, 1919-1938, Vol. I, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., New York, 1941, pp. 316-317.
in pre-recession days, in 1929.\textsuperscript{15} The complicated

\textsuperscript{15}Prices in Recession and Recovery, A Survey of Recent Changes, Frederick C. Mills, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., in cooperation with The Committee on Recent Economic Changes, New York, 1936, p. 419.

spending program of the government brought visible effects to the public in the form of relief checks, public buildings, bonus payments; thus, it is clear that the public experienced mingled feelings in surveying the fact that the country struck an all-time high in expenditure, taxation and debt in 1936.\textsuperscript{16}


Rapid organization put the new agricultural program into effect in time to bring compensation from the Treasury to the farmers who cooperated in 1936. Drought struck the Mid-West again in the summer of 1936; in June the President felt that the situation threatened to be dangerous and appointed an Inter-departmental Drought Committee "to coordinate and accelerate" the relief activities of various national and State organizations.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17}The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V., p. 265.
Thus, it seems clear that the administration intended to serve directly the interests of the farm and labor groups and to oppose directly the forces of monopoly and big business, identifying them in their effects upon liberty with the autocratic tendencies strangling freedom in other countries. However, this note of defiance to the business groups was not sustained in three important addresses made by the President prior to the conventions.

The President's address at Rollins College, Florida, on receiving an honorary degree, dealt with "New Approaches to Old Problems"; his address to the Young Democratic Club, Baltimore, Maryland, April 13, was entitled "The Period of Social Pioneering is Only at Its Beginning"; his address at the Thomas Jefferson Dinner, New York City, April 25, explained that "Nationwide Thinking, Nationwide Planning and Nationwide Action Are the Three Great Essentials to Prevent Nationwide Crises."

The Republican Convention met in Cleveland, Ohio, on June 9, 1936. Frederick Steiwer of Oregon aroused high enthusiasm with his keynote address, declaring

"For more than three long years we have had a government without political morality... When this convention shall have finished its labors we shall offer the country a candidate with a sense of duty, and a platform that binds his conscience to guarantee to America that the nation shall not again be deceived by political
adventurers who have perverted the most sacred fundamentals of our government."\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{20}The New York Times, June 10, 1936.

Permanent chairman Snell won cheers from the delegates with his statement of the one purpose of the Republican campaign: "to lead America against the unconstitutional individualism of Franklin Delano Roosevelt."\textsuperscript{21} Samuel G. Blythe, reporting the convention, pointed out that "The most significant feature of this convention is the quiet, calm, unanimous determination to defeat the president..."\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid.

And Herbert Hoover, rising to a stature he had lost in the presidential chair, called the Republicans to a "holy crusade for liberty" and avowed that

"We must achieve freedom in the economic field. Let this convention declare, without shrinking, the source of economic prosperity is freedom. The gravest task which confronts the party is to regenerate these freedoms."\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{23}Vital Speeches, 2: 572-3, June 15, 1936, "A Holy Crusade for Liberty."

On the evening of Hoover's address to the
Republican Convention, President Roosevelt spoke to a crowd of 50,000 (or 60,000) people at the Arkansas Centennial Celebration in Little Rock, Arkansas. He drew laughter and applause in his "non-political" address when he remarked that Jefferson had made the Louisiana Purchase "without the full and unanimous approval of every member of the legal profession" and that "nobody carried the case to the Supreme Court." Roosevelt returned to his indictment of "big business" with the statement that "Mechanization of industry and mass production have put unparalleled power in the hands of the few. No small part of our problem today is to bring the fruits of this mechanization and mass production to the people as a whole."

Writing the Republican platform posed serious problems. The Supreme Court decision of June 1, invalidating the New York State Minimum Wage Law, was unpopular among Republicans as well as Democrats and killed Republican hopes for an effective stand in support of all decisions of the Court. Popular approval of social advances precluded opposition to their continuance.
Shifting of power within the party brought a contradictory platform. The delegates finally voted to emphasize states' rights in the administration of relief, in protection of women and children in industry, and in the control of social security; to foster a Federal farm program and to renew the protective tariff policy; to enforce the anti-monopoly laws and to afford Federal regulation of such phases of business as the security markets; and to remove government competition with private industry and eliminate restrictions on production; to reduce government spending, revise tax laws, and balance the budget; to oppose further devaluation of the dollar and cooperate for international stabilization; to oppose the World Court and the League of Nations but to cooperate in the limitation of armaments.  

---

27 Anne O'Hare McCormick declared: "The prairies are in revolt against the Old Guard and the Old Guard caved in before the assault because they had reconciled themselves to defeat." The New York Times, June 14, 1936.

28 Arthur Krock characterized the platform thus: A soft money plank for the big exporters, a hard money telegram from the candidate for the Eastern financiers; an attack on government competition with industry balanced by a drastic anti-monopoly plank written by William Jennings Bryan in 1900 and revised by Senator Borah--these are typical of the Cleveland platform." The New York Times, June 28, 1936.

29 Prospective nominee
Landon's telegram to the convention opened the possibility of a constitutional amendment, declared for "hard money" and called for the strengthening of the Civil Service. The nomination of the Kansas governor, Alfred M. Landon, for the Republican candidate for the presidency was consistent with the "grass-roots" nature of the convention: it was known that he balanced the budget in Kansas and had, in 1934, offered a farm relief plan to the consideration of the President.

The Democratic Convention met two weeks later, in Philadelphia, on June 23, 1936. One thousand one hundred delegates, two-thirds of whom were political officeholders or party workers, gathered to endorse the program of the party. After five days of riotous haggling, the Democrats accepted a program of principles which stood approximately as Roosevelt had approved it in preconvention conferences with Senator Robert Wagner of New York, resolutions committee chairman. Arthur Krock pointed
out that in three particulars the platform was especially Roosevelt's:

"The preamble, paraphrasing parts of the Declaration of Independence...the reiteration of the statement about the farmer, the businessman, youth, labor and other groups, after recounting measures taken to put him on the path to recovery...and the avoidance of specific planks to permit a general review of performance and a general statement of future policy."33

Walter Lippman pointed out another feature of the platform which is important in any appraisal of Roosevelt's conception of governmental function:

"One vital essence of the platform lies in this invitation to come to the government, this broad generous spirit of hospitality to the demands of all groups, this eager willingness to use the powers of government to help them all."34

The platform declared:

"The issue in this election is plain. The American people are called upon to choose between a Republican administration that has and would again regiment them in the service of privileged groups and a Democratic administration dedicated to the establishment of equal opportunity for all our people."35
And the platform set three great objectives: protection of family and home, establishment of a democracy of opportunity, and aid to those overtaken by disaster.

Means declared were these: control of kidnappers and bandits, elimination of speculation, establishment of old age and social security, consideration for consumers' prices and veterans' welfare, development of rural electrification and of housing.

Means declared were these: constructive programs for agriculture, labor, business and the youth, and the control of monopolistic concentrations of economic power.

Means declared were these: aid in drought and floods, reemployment in regular work or work at regular wages in useful projects, meeting of national problems within the Constitution or through clarifying amendment, extension of merit system, guarding of civil liberties, reduction of expenditures and balancing of budget, maintain the policy of the "good neighbor" in foreign relations and lower trade barriers.

The convention was Roosevelt's in another way:

Farley had arranged for every State to second Roosevelt's renomination—48 speeches plus 9 from non-voting areas.

This crescendo of fervor, though somewhat disorderly and
cheapened during the ballyhoo of the convention, provided the immediate psychological setting for the acceptance speech by the President at Franklin Field on the evening of June 27, 1936. The more basic climate of opinion was provided by the impact of relief, recovery and reform measures, by the fact of recovery itself, and by pro-New Deal or anti-New Deal allegiance.

**The Audience**

The Democratic National Convention, meeting in Philadelphia from June 23 to June 27, 1936, had seated 1,100 delegates. Two-thirds of these persons were political office-holders or party workers. These delegates moved from the convention hall out into Franklin Field, the huge stadium normally used by the University of Pennsylvania for its football games, to dedicate the final session to the acceptance address of their candidate. Their number was swelled to 100,000 by New Dealers from the
surrounding areas. The President's body-guard,

Two hundred thousand tickets had been printed and were distributed free at booths in Philadelphia. Boss Frank Hague of Jersey City had "delivered legions of his well-drilled yeomanry." *Time*, 28: 9, July 6, 1936.

Michael F. Reilly, declared that "Every seat in the huge stands was taken and every inch of the gridiron was crammed. It was a magnificent night, with a moon and pleasant balmy breezes." Although the earlier comers had been wet by showers, the full assembly met "in the evening calmness under the open sky." Raymond Clapper pointed out that this group of listeners, to whom loud speakers were to carry the proceedings, was "undoubtedly the largest political audience ever assembled in this country." There is no doubt that the sea of faces which surrounded the President
as he spoke from the flood-lighted platform in the huge arena was a sea of New Deal faces, faces brightened by three and a half years of New Deal enthusiasms, programs and largesse. Although Raymond Moley had warned in 1935 and was to declare again four days after Roosevelt's acceptance address that the public was wearying of crusade and reform, it is doubtful that such weariness was felt or evidenced in this immense throng.

47 "A year ago I wrote a piece in which I pointed out that, unless Congress eased up a little in its quest for reform, there was danger that the public would become so tired of contentiousness and strife, that it would rush into reaction—Human nature began to refuse to stay on a crusading plane just as it had many times in the past. I believe that mood has become intensified and more widespread in the year just past." Moley spoke before the convention of the Advertising Federation of America, Boston, Massachusetts, on July 1, 1936. Vital Speeches, 2: 637, July 15, 1936, "The Future of Corporate Prophets."

48 The presence of the fervent delegates and of other ardent enthusiasts in the vast audience of sympathetic hearers would act to leaven the whole mass further. "If the speaker is interested in welding together, mentally, the members of his audience, for purposes of enthusiasm and concerted feeling, it is important to realize that spiritual sympathy is promoted by physical proximity. Students of crowd psychology lay great stress on the influence of the consciousness of the bodily nearness of associates and fellows." H. L. Hollingworth, The Psychology of the Audience, American Book Co., New York, 1935, p. 164.

doubtful that these New Deal enthusiasts were troubled by the "spirits" of the founding fathers or by the "shades" of
the Continental Congress, as Hoover had warned them.

Hoover had declared before the Republican Women of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia on May 14, 1936, that "In another sixty days the New Deal party will convene in this city, where American liberty was first proclaimed....Under the invisible presence of the men who founded a nation that liberty might live, they should apologize to the American people. Instead they will produce splendidious alibis. But the spirits of Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams and Franklin will judge their promises and their stewardship." Mr. Hoover pointed out later in his speech that "When the New Dealers' convention meets near Independence Hall they will no doubt summon with powerful oratory over a hundred broadcasting stations the shades of that heroic Continental Congress. I trust at that moment the American people will remember what the New Deal has done to the Congress of the United States in these recent years."

Vital Speeches, 2: 556, 558, June 1, 1936, "Constructive Alternatives."

Probably the attacks of their opponents, voiced over radio system and from platform, and the strong accusations of


editorial writers were felt rather as issues upon which

"About 85 per cent of the press of the Nation supported the opposition." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 3.

they might desire to hear their candidate speak than as condemnations from which he must extricate himself. Raymond
Clapper was impressed by the spirit of this great throng:

"In nearly 20 years of political reporting, I have never in any political meeting observed quite the atmosphere which dominated this night. The audience was not noisy, wild, nor hysterical, but it was sympathetic--deeply so, I should say. It listened. It seemed to understand..."\(^{52}\)

\(^{52}\)Washington Daily News, June 29, 1936.

Thus, Roosevelt came from the White House to Franklin Field to deliver the acceptance address before the largest audience he had ever faced\(^ {53}\) and probably the largest political audience so far assembled in America. He spoke before a group generally committed to his principles and favorably to his candidacy.

Those listening in the 21,000,000 radio homes of America were, no doubt, less unanimous in their support. Both groups--the opposition forces, who listened to attack and reinterpret, and the supporting forces, who listened to admire and feel themselves a part of the national organization--both groups were aware of the undeniable fact of recovery. Recipients of the New Deal's favors--the farmers, the laborers, youth, relief workers--were
naturally favorable to the candidacy of the author of these favors; recipients of the New Deal's vengeance—corporations and business men in general—were naturally unfavorable to the candidacy of the author of their restriction. Those Republicans who adhered to party lines and the Democrats who balked at the Roosevelt policies—these were unfavorable to his candidacy.

No matter where their sympathies lay, the public listened as to a speaker whom they knew. Roosevelt's thousands of addresses and rear platform talks throughout the nation on his vice-presidential campaign trip of 1912, on his presidential campaign journeys in 1932, and on his numerous jaunts to drought and flood areas, to WPA projects and CCC camps, to centennials and conventions—these had made his face and figure personally familiar to millions of those who listened to his acceptance address by means of the radio. His photographs in the newspapers, magazines and newsreels had carried his smile to all corners of the land. Furthermore, his voice had come into the people's homes with the Fireside Chats.

This sense of intimacy with the distant unseen speaker, afforded by long familiarity with his face and voice, is a factor in the mental set of his country-wide audience which may not be disregarded. That Roosevelt
recognized the personal basis of the decision being made in the country is shown by his statement to Raymond Moley, "There's one issue in this campaign. It's myself, and people must be either for me or against me." Whatever complex of issues had been formative in the viewpoints of Roosevelt's listeners, it is likely that his radio audience of June 27, 1936, could be divided rather simply into two distinct but oddly constituted classes--those who believed in Roosevelt and those who wanted desperately to "stop Roosevelt." This concentration and personalization of the issue and this simplification of audience groups were factors which no effective speaker could ignore. The thesis he would choose for the occasion would of necessity be selected carefully to fit these conditions of credibility, as he perceived them.

Earl Wiley's interpretation of Aristotle's stand on credibility is this: "He came to hold that believability lay not solely in the speaker as a man, not in the audience as a group, nor in the objective facts as such; rather, he held that believability lay in the speaker, in hearer, and in thesis, mutually. The task of the speaker in a progressive society is to winnow the concepts needed for the occasion from the several sources of believability, and to process the parts into utterance." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 29: 162, April, 1943, "The Rhetoric of the American Democracy."
The Immediate Setting of the Speech

The one hundred thousand listeners who were crowded into Franklin Field at 10 o'clock on the evening of June 27, 1936, were participants in a mighty spectacle. The dense mass of faces about the tiny stage in the vast arena, the play of strong lights upon this very heart of the crowd, the stately and inspiring music of the Philadelphia Symphony--these were emotional factors of undeniable strength in the psychological setting for the speech.56

56 George Van Slyke wrote of this setting: "Emotionalism ran riot at Mr. Roosevelt's notification in Philadelphia, whipped up by five days of intensive ballyhoo by expert politicians and officeholders. It was the culmination of a masterful piece of showmanship. The dramatics and theatricals were all employed. Mr. Roosevelt perfectly typified the New Deal and his campaign in the beautifully arranged scene in Franklin Field." New York Sun, July 25, 1936.

Raymond Clapper described the proceedings more fully: "...as the Philadelphia Convention recedes into memory no one who was there will easily forget the night at Franklin Field, which revealed Roosevelt, not merely the good political showman, but a master ripened into the fullness of his powers. It is not probable that many of us who were there shall experience anything like it again." He pointed out the mood of sympathetic understanding, the spirit of dignity which seemed to fall over the crowd. "Undoubtedly the arrangements contributed toward creating this mood. Instead of a brassy band blaring out "Hail, Hail the Gang's All Here," the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra played the final movement of a Tschaikowsky symphony...Then beside the director's stand a small, white doll-like figure appeared. Lily Pons, the Metropolitan Opera Company's little songbird. She bared her tiny throat,
to that vast crowd, to whom she must have appeared no larger than a snowflake and sang the 'Song of the Lark.' One hundred thousand people sat in breathless enchantment. In that vast ocean of people gathered for a political hurrah, there was not the faintest stirring, not a sound save the muffled clicking of telegraph instruments in the press box. When she finished, dozens of political writers were on their feet joining in the deafening applause. Something had happened to that audience. It had been lifted, not to a cheap political emotional pitch, but something finer. It was ready for Roosevelt.

"He entered the arena, not to some raucous thumping air, but to the symphony orchestra's stringing of 'Pomp and Circumstance.'

"Preliminaries were dispatched quickly and then Roosevelt spoke. It was his moment. It was now or never. This was the flood-tide of his opportunity." Washington Daily News, June 29, 1936.

Nor was the radio audience immune from the tremendous impact of these emotional factors. They heard a band play triumphantly "Happy Days are Here Again" and a continuous round of clapping interspersed with cheers, and then the announcer's voice saying:

"Even though the words 'Ladies and Gentlemen, the President' are the traditional signals for silence as the nation's Chief Executive begins his address, there is no silencing the hundred thousand in Franklin Field. Standing before the speaker's rostrum, Franklin Delano Roosevelt waves cheerily with his hand--right hand--at the crowd--just, just indescribable; all you can see--faces, fading away into nothingness, apparently they go reaching for miles and miles and miles, and to another city. The President waves cheerily with a right hand, and we can see that one of the small buttons on the blue sleeve of his right cuff, incidentally, is broken away--the same sort of small accident that happens to millions of men throughout the country when their suits come back from being pressed at the tailor's.
The President beams and smiles, apparently not at all perturbed at being forced to wait as the crowd gives him this tremendous demonstration. And the night shall be filled with music, and the sound of the crowd shall explode like ten thousand hand grenades that smash against the sky.

Flags are poked up in the audience, and waved back and forth here and there. Somebody holds up a state banner—it's New York—and tries to wave it back and forth. Kansas goes up now, and that too is lost in the glare of light.

And at last Franklin Delano Roosevelt waves, the crowd down soothingly with his right hand and his left hand, and that means that he is about to begin his speech of acceptance for the renomination of the Democratic National Party.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the President of the United States."57

But the psychological impact upon the hearers is not conditioned by the emotional factors present before the address only; the total effect of the speech will be conditioned by the emotional factors present immediately after its delivery also. And Roosevelt sustained and augmented the elevated tone of the whole occasion by the dignity and simplicity of his farewells.58 Again the color

57 Text of this announcement is taken from the recording made for the writer by the National Broadcasting Company from its master records.

58 Raymond Clapper described the close of the spectacle in these words: "But the master's superb touch was still to come. As he finished, standing there with his mother and family around him, the strains of 'Auld Lang Syne' floated out over the audience. There was a pause. 'I'd like to hear "Auld Lang Syne" again,' the President said. The
audience joined in, these thousands and Roosevelt, as old friends who had fought through the crisis together. Still a third time it was repeated. As a political theme song, it will be a hard one to beat.

"In a moment Roosevelt was gone. The audience stood in its tracks for quite some time, as if still under the spell, and then quietly began to leave." Washington Daily News, June 29, 1936.

Michael F. Reilly, Roosevelt's bodyguard, spoke of the applause while Roosevelt's car circled the running track: "There he received the greatest ovation I ever heard, and in ten years with FDR I heard an awful lot of ovations." Op. cit., pp. 100-101.

The radio audience heard a band playing "The Stars and Stripes Forever" and then the announcer's words:

"So the thirty-second President of the United States puts the climax to the greatest single political drama the nation has yet seen. As the startling roar of the crowd echoes to the clouds above Philadelphia's Franklin Field, the country's Chief Executive stands in the stormy shower of light that beats fiercely over his head and shoulders and spills into a blinding pool on the platform floor below. His last words are completely lost to the great crowd that started its shrieking as the President began his last sentence.

"He waves his head, smiles again, shakes his hand to the great crowd as they wave back, attempting to climb on shoulders, wanting to see the Chief Executive at least.

"The band breaks into the theme-song of the last campaign, 'Happy Days are Here Again'.

"The President with his own left hand grasps the right hand of the Vice President and waves it to the crowd in a fervent handclasp and a warm embrace."

Text of this announcement is taken from the rerecording made by the National Broadcasting Company for the writer.
served the President's address as the setting for a gem for the setting not only required a high standard of excellence in its jewel but enhanced the beauty and power of the jewel.

The elevation of mood achieved before the President's address required thoughts and words of high dignity and purpose; the close physical contact of the listeners and their common participation in appreciating uplifting music had united them into an audience which was polarized to an unusual degree.

Consideration of the immediate setting of the speech must include the psychological factors effective upon the speaker himself at this time also.

Roosevelt's bodyguard, Michael Reilly, remarked on the President's mental attitude as he approached this important occasion. Reilly declared that "The Boss was confident and happy. He had solid signs that the fight against the depression was to be victorious. He was sure the people were behind him and he had a good speech in his hands and he knew it."60 Although the New York Times explained that none of Roosevelt's speeches had been "more of his own devising than the one he gave in Philadelphia, 61
the real development of the speech can perhaps be more truly seem from the report by Raymond Moley, the President's adviser who was recalled to help with the acceptance speech. Moley indicated that Bernard Baruch had suggested "Serenity and Service" as the theme, that Moley himself had worked on speech drafts, and that on the morning before the address was to be given the President revised it himself to add more "fire" by substituting an attack on "economic royalists" for a passage on cooperation. Moley also reported that the President had said that he wanted the speech to be only fifteen minutes in length and to rise to a very serious note. Newsweek stated that the President's words for the precise pitch he wanted were "short and snappy" and not too "rough". Out of these preparations emerged a speech with which the President approached the occasion confidently. No analysis of the psychological factors affecting
the speaker on this occasion can omit mention of three other incidents which occurred before he began his address. Making his stiff-legged way along the narrow path through the crowd behind the stage, the President was jostled, his right brace was unsnapped, and he fell. 64 Bob Trout, who

64 Michael Reilly, Roosevelt's bodyguard, reported that the President had reached out to shake hands with Edwin Markham, the famous, elderly poet. Someone in the crowd pushed Markham heavily against James Roosevelt, who fell against his father. The President was badly shaken by his fall, and "was white and worried, because he had little enough confidence in braces, at best." But he completed the handshake with Markham smilingly and proceeded to the platform with only a few members of the audience aware of the catastrophe. op. cit., pp. 98-99.

had often introduced the President to the radio audience, at Roosevelt's death, told over CBS this happening, so indicative of the President's strong command of himself, and explained that the pages of the manuscript had been scattered in the fall. After Roosevelt had been seated on the stage in full view of the crowd, these muddied, crumpled pages were brought to him and he reassembled them hastily. The moments before the address was to begin were taken up, reported Paul Ward in his "Washington Weekly" notes for the Nation Magazine, by Philadelphia's Mayor Wilson, who insisted on pouring into the President's ear the minutest details of police guardians, fire-fighters
and machine guns in readiness against dangers of assassination. "Then, to make matters worse, Senator Robinson, who was to speak four minutes in introducing Roosevelt, lost his manuscript and spoke only one minute, thereby catching the President unawares." Despite these repeated challenges to his confidences and poise, the President accepted calmly and happily the huge ovation which was accorded him when he appeared on the platform.

**The Speech**

The carefully arranged atmosphere of warmth, dignity and exaltation tended to arouse a sense of something unique, not to be experienced again; that Roosevelt seemed to fit supremely well the splendid music, the quiet uplifted people was an ethical victory of inestimable importance. Tacit recognition of his success in gaining the warm esteem of great numbers of citizens everywhere appears in his salutation:

"Senator Robinson, Members of the Democratic Convention, my friends here and in every community throughout the land."

Mr. Robinson, the Democratic majority leader in the Senate, had visited Hyde Park earlier in the week, with twenty-seven
other Democratic leaders, to discuss campaign strategy with the President. Roosevelt's speech at Little Rock for the

Arkansas Centennial on June 10, 1936, had been regarded by politicians as a public request to the voters for the reelection of Senator Robinson. It may be called to mind that Senator Robinson had been the Democrat to answer Al Smith's attack on the administration before the Liberty League in January, 1936. And also Landon's Buffalo

Smith had declared that the administration had been Socialist in both platform and record. Vital Speeches, 2: 285, February 10, 1936.

Robinson had broadcast an answer from Washington, D.C., on January 28, saying:

"Where have I heard that charge of socialism and communism before? Oh, now I recall, that's the identical charge that Herbert Hoover made against you in 1928."


speech on indirect taxes on August 26, 1936.
This close political and personal tie was present not only between the President and the man chosen to introduce him; it was felt also between the delegates—the enthusiastic office-holders and the office-seekers who had voted an unanimous ballot for their candidate—and their highly-acclaimed leader. And there was a deeply felt bond between Roosevelt and the common people of America. He drew these unseen listeners into the circle of the great crowd in Franklin Field by employing his familiar, long-used special greeting, "my friends," with additional
Roosevelt had used this term of direct address as a salutation as early as his first expected address in support of Al Smith's candidacy in Binghamton, New York, October 17, 1928. (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. I, p. 16) He used the term also within the body of this address. (Ibid., p. 19)

words to include them all, "here and in every community throughout the land." Undoubtedly both the radio audience and the audience facing him directly were influenced strongly by the impression of being a part of a huge circle of friends." 73

73 "The knowledge that the majority hold a given opinion inclines many individuals favorably toward the majority's decision." H. L. Hollingworth, Op. cit., p. 150.

Whatever integration of feeling had not been already achieved in Franklin Field by the common appreciation of the splendid music, by the fanfare of lights, by the mere elbow-to-elbow reaction to Roosevelt's appearance on the platform was now achieved through the sense of belonging which Roosevelt afforded them by his greeting; the radio announcer's vivid description of the scene and the surges of music and cheers were now augmented in effect by the President's direct inclusion of his radio audience. 74

This unanimity of attention and feeling Roosevelt at once concentrated upon the importance of the present time.

The logical framework of the speech is as follows:

I. The present occasion is important.
   A. Roosevelt comes as President as well as candidate.
   B. New problems have arisen.

II. Economic freedom must be won.
   A. Economic royalists have dominated.
      1. They have regimented the people.
      2. They have attempted to control government.
   B. The government has undertaken to end this tyranny.
      1. The people appealed to government.
      2. Allegiance to American institutions demands the overthrow of tyranny.
      3. The convention platform pledges continuation of the fight.

III. This fight has given us understanding.
   A. It has shown us that moral principle is the greatest guide.
   B. It has attempted to use faith, hope and charity as supports.

IV. This great cause is a sobering one.
   A. It belongs to the people of America
   B. Errors occur but are preferable to inaction.
   C. It is a struggle to preserve democracy for our country and for the world.
The present occasion is important.

Echoes of the Gettysburg Address appeared in the first sentence, doubtless giving many a vague, pleasing sense of familiarity:

"We are met at a time of great moment to the future of the nation, an occasion to be dedicated....I come not only as a leader....This is fitting ground on which to reaffirm the faith of the fathers...."

Declaration of the speaker's purpose as "the simple and sincere expression of an attitude towards problems, the determination of which will profoundly affect America" was significant in the pathetic and ethical appeal of its promise of exalted treatment of important issues.76

---

76The identification of speaker and audience with such a purpose flattered the judgment of the audience and demonstrated to them the prestige of the speaker. Robert Oliver has made the following explanation of the primary characteristics of a leader: "In the first place, he must belong to and be a part of his following, and in the second place he must rise superior to his followers. ....His leadership comes in part from the recognition that he is a fitting symbol of what the group stands for. ....But on the other hand, the group will not turn to him as a leader unless he is a superior exponent in a number of ways. Very commonly it consists of a superiority of language --an ability to express fluently and attractively what everyone feels but cannot put into words for himself....He who can put the vague longings of the crowd into a definite credo is exalted into the leadership....Sometimes, too, this superiority of the leader consists in his energetic and forceful feeling of what the group feels with less impulsion....Or the superiority of the leader may consist of his standing for the best of the group's conceptions....The people always tend to idealize, and sometimes to idolize, the leader who will formulate for
them the best and highest potentialities that exist within themselves.

"The art of leadership, then, might be concisely defined as the ability to belong to a group thoroughly, while rising above it in power of speech, in intensity of feeling, or in fineness of character. The ideal leader transcends his group in all three of these ways." Op. cit., pp. 84-85.

"If we watch a speaker who is well poised, masterful, fluent, attractive, we enjoy being part of him... The persuasive speaker aids his cause when his audience enjoys sympathizing with him." Ibid., p. 138.

assurance of understandable expression, 77 and its accuracy

77 Margaret L. Suckley, archivist at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York, and relative of the late President, made the following statement in a letter of October 21, 1947, to the writer:

"Mr. Roosevelt often expressed the thought that many public speeches and writings (legal documents, etc.) were written in language that the average man could not understand. He said he tried, in his own speeches, to use simple language—'words of two syllables, so to speak'—so that every one would understand what he was talking about."

of representation of his philosophy of a government of "direction" rather than one dedicated to specific remedies. 78

78 "True leadership calls for the setting forth of objectives and the rallying of public opinion in support of these objectives.

"Do not confuse objectives with methods. When the nation becomes substantially united in favor of planning the broad objectives of civilization, then true leadership must unite thought behind definite methods." Address at Oglethorpe University, May 22, 1932. The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. I, p. 638.

However unsatisfactory such a stand might have been to a small, thoughtful, logically-oriented audience, 79 it was
Roosevelt recognized that there were several remedies to meet the Supreme Court's action in declaring basic acts of his program unconstitutional, as he explained in the introduction to Volume V of The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and hence, rather than advocating one during the campaign, "Emphasis...was therefore properly placed on the goal of a Government which, through the cooperation of all its branches, would make democracy work." pp. 4-5.

more obviously suited to the size and emotional orientation of Roosevelt's audience on June 27, 1936.

"The larger the audience, the higher the motives to which appeal may be made..." Baker and Huntington, Op. Cit. pp. 321.

Roosevelt comes as President as well as candidate. Roosevelt immediately raised the listeners' goodwill to a higher level by turning the emphasis away from his candidacy and toward the heavy responsibilities he had been facing as President of the country. This reference to the burdens of leadership held strong ethical appeal for his favorable Philadelphia audience, and for those throughout the nation who supported his interpretation and use of governmental power. The sober, almost tired,

This reference to past "responsibility" would doubtless recall to farmer, laborer, business man, relief worker, depositor, the allegiance and gratitude which he owed for the President's actions in his behalf; however, to "big
business" and the moneyed interests as well as to property owners in general the reference would mean government interference, assumption of power, and dangerous increases of expenditure. That his responsibilities were not ended, although a large share of the people whom he was addressing were able to buy goods as in pre-recession days, tacitly emphasized the numbers still unemployed, the incipient drought in the Middle West, the increase of dictatorial aggression in Europe. (Six weeks earlier, speaking at Chautauqua, New York, Roosevelt had pointed out that he was "more concerned and less cheerful about international world conditions than about our immediate domestic prospects." Vital Speeches, 2: 730, September 1, 1936, "Peace."

inflection of the President's voice on "a grave responsibility" must have held a strong ethical appeal to the ones who had benefited from his performance of the task.

Again, the President immediately deepened the power of this emotional effect by turning the emphasis from himself; the qualities for which he thanked various groups of Americans were significant choices.\(^\text{82}\) Nowhere had the President's belief in personal relationship between leader and people stood out more clearly than in his gratitude for their "sympathy." After the President had asked, as in the First Fireside Chat of 1935\(^\text{83}\) for letters


\(^{83}\) for letters
"Feel free to criticize. Tell me of instances where work can be done better, or where improper practices prevail. Neither you nor I want criticism conceived in a purely fault-finding or partisan spirit, but I am jealous of the right of every citizen to call to the attention of his or her Government examples of how the public money can be more effectively spent for the benefit of the American people." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. IV, pp. 137-138.

from the people, he received much correspondence directly from them. For their attempt to help with the immense problems facing the government in 1933, Roosevelt did not omit gratitude. Even those who felt that he had acted unwisely or without authority in his administration would not deny the severity of the situation with which he had had to deal. Each listener heard the words in the climate of his own experience, and received the general
impression of becoming and unexpected humility in the speaker.

The tribute of loyalty to members of the Democratic Party was indeed justified before the delegates who had renominated him unanimously, and might also have served to offset somewhat the claim of disaffected Democrats that he had destroyed the "Party." His expression of gratitude to non-Democratic Members of Congress who had supported his measures put any of these men, now disaffected, into the category of back-sliders; its implication is that the withdrawal of support would result from partisan reasons rather than from actual opposition to the measures. Reference to the unselfish devotion of state and local officials not only brought these groups

86 "The mind of man is peopled, like some silent city, with a sleeping company of reminiscences, associations, impressions, attitudes, emotions, to be awakened into fierce activity at the touch of words." Walter Raleigh, Style, Edward Arnold, London, 1898, p. 10.

87 Frederick Steiwer, keynoter at the Republican National Convention, had declared of this support, "In the beginning of its Administration Republicans in Congress forgot politics in their desire to cooperate." Vital Speeches, 2: 576, June 15, 1936, "Three Long Years."

88 The Governors' Conference in Washington, D.C., on March 6, 1933, adopted a pledge of support to Roosevelt

into the limelight flatteringly but reminded them that no government had been able to meet the challenge of the day except the Federal Government. The praise to "the millions of Americans who have borne disaster bravely and have dared to smile through the storm" was thrown out with a camaraderie which separated the in-groups and the out-groups challengingly. This selection of the brave smile as the evidence of confidence was indeed effective: it flattered the people for their courage; it recognized an overt symbol which was communicative in nature; it praised the millions for an action in response to his example of smiling courage; it called to their minds the picture of their leader smiling; it completed the identification

89 Robert T. Oliver pointed out in his careful study of audience reactions that "The establishment of a reputation depends upon some emphatic, dramatic, and uniform type of impression which the individual makes." He cited Roosevelt's smile as an example of such an impression. Op. cit., p. 96.

This impression of smiling courage was in itself strongly ethical, for the evidence of his crippled body but uncrippled spirit was not to be denied. Dr. E. B. Krumbhaar, friend of Roosevelt at Groton and Harvard and now consulting psychopathologist at Philadelphia General Hospital, declared in a letter to the writer of February 1, 1948, "It was not until the latter part of college days that his qualities of ambition, perservance, and ability to sell himself became apparent, and, in my opinion, it
was later still, through his polio attack, that his dormant quality of courage was brought out."

of the listeners with their leader. 90

90 Raymond Clapper, the astute journalist who had watched Roosevelt's development with a carefully critical eye, concluded that acts which were "good politics" came naturally and instinctively to Roosevelt. (Watching the World, 1934-44, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, p. 88) Frances Perkins, who knew the President well both politically and personally, wrote, "He had the naive idea that those who had joined up with him politically, or personally, were really on his side, belonged to his club, so to speak, and were with him through thick and thin." (Op. cit., p. 157)

With a severe drop in tone of voice, Roosevelt reminded his listeners that those years would not be forgotten by America, that cooperation had brought survival. His words "applied the old rules of common sense" were implicit refutation of charges that he had destroyed American institutions and had tried foreign formulas. 91

91 Ex-President Herbert Hoover, speaking before the Republican Convention in Cleveland, Ohio, on June 10, 1936, had said that "the New Deal is a definite attempt to replace the American system of freedom with some sort of European planned existence." Vital Speeches, 2: 571, June 15, 1936, "A Holy Crusade for Liberty."

There is no denying that Roosevelt followed the policies of the British economist, John M. Keynes, in regard to starting the wheels of business to moving by government spending. Broadus Mitchell, Depression Decade, (The Economic History of the United States, Vol. IX), Rinehart & Company, Inc., New York, 1947, p. 125. Though a social objective for the nation would indeed be common sense, it
does not follow logically that all plans to achieve that objective would also be so characterized; thus, Roosevelt's statement would have validity for those who would accept his basic premise; it would be vigorously disputed by others.

In this concisely-built summary sentence, "In our strength we rose together, rallied our energies together, applied the old rules of common sense, and together survived," the strength lies in the verbs and shows clearly Roosevelt's emphasis on action. The displacement of the word "together" in the last phrase from its expected position shifts the emphasis at that point from the cooperative effort itself to the triumphant result of that effort. The effectiveness of repetition is enhanced by the simplicity of the terms used and by the power gained by placement and pause for the climactic word.

"He had analyzed the people's mandate of 1932 as a request for "direct, vigorous action" (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. II, p. 15) and the swift legislation of the "Hundred Days" was the answer. Emil Ludwig pointed out that "He loves the word 'action,' and his tone, when he speaks of it, is like that of the singer speaking of voice, the sculptor speaking of stone...it is the focal word of his life." Roosevelt, A Study in Fortune and Power, Viking Press, New York, 1938, p. 297.

The structural effectiveness of this sentence arises from its fine adaptation to Roosevelt's basic thinking. Genung, the well-known Amherst rhetorician, pointed out that, in writing, the author should seek to transcribe the writer's individual sense of fact and that "this latter imparts to it the literary quality, a character and a
coloring due both to the intrinsic nature of the fact itself and to the writer's own personality." The Working Principles of Rhetoric, Ginn & Co., Boston, 1900, p. 18. Thus, Roosevelt portrayed not only the story of the recovery but his own interpretation of its factors.

The President's change in the sentence, "It was in those days, my friends, that we feared fear," allowed

The printed version is "In those days we feared fear." (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 231) The NBC recording shows the change.

him, by the two additional introductory words, to stress more significantly by prolongation, voice inflection and pause, the word "those," the word designed to catch up for the mind's review the calamities of the depression days.

Lack of confidence prevailing in early 1933 is indicated by the fact that "in the ten days before March 4, 1933, one and one-half billion dollars was withdrawn from banks of the Federal Reserve System." Dale Yoder and George R. Davies, Depression and Recovery, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1934, p. 38.

The added words, "my friends," are spoken in falling cadence to bring to metrical completeness the first sentence element; the rise for the climax of the sentence begins with the subordinated word "that." Power was concentrated on the closing word by preceding it forcefully with its verb form and then saying it with quick positiveness.
There is all the dramatic terseness of Caesar's "Veni, vidi, vici" in Roosevelt's trilogy: "...we feared fear....we fought fear....we have conquered fear." These assertions recalled the ringing utterance of his First Inaugural Address, "So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The source of this idea is interestingly related to Roosevelt's studies. Ralph W. Emerson quoted a similar statement from the unpublished manuscripts of Thoreau: "Nothing is so much to be feared as fear." Emerson had written a discourse on fear in his Journals at the age of twenty; at forty he published his essay, "Character," and declared:...
"Our proper vice takes form in one or another shape, according to the sex, age, or temperament of the person, and, if we are capable of fear, will readily find terrors." 99


Although the Emersonian influence upon Franklin Roosevelt was unusually strong, his acquaintance with this idea

100 Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt stated that Emersonian influence came to the President through Josiah Royce at Harvard. (Interview with writer, August 17, 1947, at Hyde Park, New York) Roosevelt had taken Philosophy 1 A, a course in Logic, from Royce in 1902. (Early Years F.D.R., His Personal Letters, edited by Elliot Roosevelt, 1.), Duell, Sloan and Pearce, New York, 1947, p. 480) It is to be noted that the centenary of Emerson's birth was celebrated in 1903. Santayana, Munsterberg, William James, and President Charles Eliot addressed groups in Cambridge and Boston. (Boston Evening Transcript, May 23, 1903, referred to the celebration at Symphony Hall in Boston in this manner: "Every ticket for the celebration was long ago given out, and the hall will not hold all those who desire to hear President Eliot's address.") It is known that William James reread the whole of Emerson's work in preparation for his address. (Bliss Perry, Emerson Today, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1931, p. 6.) Harvard University planned to call its new philosophy building, the Emerson Building. (Boston Evening Transcript, May 23, 1903.) The well-known Boylston professor of oratory and beloved public reader, Charles T. Copeland, was to give a reading from Emerson's works on the campus on May 20. (Ibid.) Two days later, Professor George Santayana was to give the second in a series of four public lectures in observance of the Emerson centennial. (Boston Evening Transcript, May 22, 1903.) At this time Roosevelt was Managing Editor of the Crimson and a busy young man on the campus. (Personal letter to this writer from Lathrop Brown, Roosevelt's roommate at Harvard,
October 15, 1947.) It seems unlikely that such a student would have been untouched by this strong surge of interest in Emerson.

of the power of fear may have come from its earlier source in the essays of Bacon. Having recalled to his

101 The words of Francis Bacon in his essay "Fortitudo" were "Nothing is terrible except fear itself." It is known that Roosevelt took a half-year course in Bacon from Dr. Fred Norris Robinson, noted editor of the Cambridge Chaucer, during his final year at Harvard. Early Years, p. 505.

audience's minds the bitter depths of 1933, Roosevelt spoke in simple words of their cooperative answer—they "fought fear"—and reminded them of their comradeship and concerted effort.

The third element in Roosevelt's powerful trilogy was introduced effectively by a characterizing and preparatory statement, "We have won against the most dangerous of our foes." This word-group delays the climax momentarily and heightens its ultimate effect. Contrast with the first two elements increases the relief and joy of this outcome. 102

102 At the time Roosevelt was speaking in Franklin Field, the American people, as a whole, were breathing more easily again. Andre Siegfried, the noted French economist, said, "It is not that Americans believe that prosperity has returned; but they would not be surprised to see it
coming 'around the corner,' according to a well-known formula. America, though still distrustful, and still shaken, is beginning to be herself again, that is, optimistic." The Living Age, 350: 290, June, 1936, "America's Crisis."

New problems have arisen.

The sense of power, which Roosevelt had invoked with this briefly-spoken review of the great national experience, was turned to a consideration of the seriousness of world conditions. This report played upon the self-respect of the listeners through giving them the sense that such a statement was their due and through assuring them that the leader considered them an audience to whom he would speak "with candor." The reminiscence evoked in

103 This striking use of negation is called "litotes"; it operates as a delicate form of understatement. Genung explained that "Instead of exhibiting a great passion of excitement and by violent language pulling the reader up to it, it works as it were to keep the reader's emotion in advance of the expressed idea, by sending his thoughts out toward a generously suggested effect or situation." Op. cit., p. 105.

Roosevelt's "all is well with the world" is vague, but the play on the well-known line from Browning's "Pippa Passes" furnishes a kind of metaphorical mould for the thought he wished to express. 104 This tone is not broken in the
"The prosperity of such an allusion depends, of course, on the reader's knowledge of the event referred to; it is a compliment to his reading, taking him as it were into the writer's confidence." Ibid., p. 91.

affirmative, specific statement which follows, for it uses a Scriptural cast of expression, for example, "gather

That Roosevelt was able to use Scriptural diction without an appearance of artificiality proves the high key of his thought and the facility of his expression. Genung had warned: "Imitation of biblical diction...is hazardous, not to say a foregone failure, because if applied to thought less serious than that of Scripture it is necessarily a parody of what is most venerated, while if applied to solemn thought it runs the risk of being either artificial—which defeats its end—or goody-goody." Ibid., p. 133.

darkly in many places" and "fullness of life." Roosevelt's reference to the growth of the war spirit in other countries was timely, but he attributed the problem for America to "the rush of modern civilization." He recommended

Japan had set up the puppet state of Manchukuo in 1932; Hitler had regained the Saar, had illegally created and air force and had openly reintroduced compulsory military service in 1935; Mussolini had completed the conquest of Ethiopia on March 7, 1936; in 1936, Hitler formed the Rome-Berlin axis and supported the rebel reactionary groups in Sapin's devastating civil war; Britain and France stood for non-intervention and the American Congress forbade the shipment of munitions to either faction.

Roosevelt had defined America's economic "dream" in his Commonwealth Club speech in San Francisco, September 23, 1932: "The dream was the dream of an economic machine, able
to raise the standard of living for everyone; to bring luxury within the reach of the humblest; to annihilate distance by steam power and later by electricity, and to release everyone from the drudgery of the heaviest manual toil." He pointed to the "growing corporation" as a danger (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. I, p. 749). Arthur Bining pointed out the increasing "industrial tempo" in the period after the Civil War, and listed many factors which "made contributions and together forged a new pattern of industrial life." The Rise of American Economic Life, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1943, p. 352.

the fight to his countrymen of all parties by linking it with the preservation of the freedoms "for which Washington and Jefferson planned and fought." Roosevelt's

Doubtless he is referring to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," our guarantees from the Constitution, to which he refers later in the address. Henry L. Ewbank and J. Jeffry Auer have pointed out that for persuasive effect the speaker should "connect his cause with great names and revered institutions." Discussion and Debate, F.S. Crofts & Co., New York, 1941, p. 261. The use of this method here has the added significance of striking at the premise of Mr. Hoover's challenge that "the spirits of Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams and Franklin" would be judging the New Dealers met in convention in Philadelphia. Vital Speeches, 2: 556, June 1, 1936, "Constructive Alternatives." Roosevelt's assertion that his fight is in line with the thought of the founders is a use of the yes-technique, "a specialized form of starting on common ground, of starting with agreements instead of differences." Norwood Brigance, Speech Composition, F.S. Crofts & Co., New York, 1945, p. 167. Thus, Roosevelt utilized this identification of purpose to meet the questioning of Americans who had urged reform in 1933 but who now were becoming increasingly willing to go back to the older ways.

tentative inflection when speaking of these unsolved problems and undetermined action contrasted sharply with the
positive fall of pitch which closed his assertion that
"we have conquered fear."

His compliment to Philadelphia not only pleased
his Franklin Field audience, heavily Philadelphian in
composition, but no doubt affected any American pleasantly
for there was essential fitness in writing history at this
birthplace of freedom. Pathetic appeal is strong here in
the parallel between the present task and the venerated
cause of the past, in the religious flavor of "faith of
the fathers," and in the balance in terminal rhyme and
metrical extension of the terms "1936" and "1776", a
balance will set before the listeners by the similarity
in pause and in inflection and duration of the syllables.

The climax of power and attention falls upon
these important words, "an American way of life."\(^{109}\)

\(^{109}\)Roosevelt read Lincoln's definition of liberty to
the audience in Wilmington, Delaware, the home of the Du
Pont corporations, on October 29, 1936, and declared this
explanation of the right of a man to do as he pleased with
himself and the product of his labor was applicable in
1936. The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D.

Roosevelt's identification of his policy with the American
way of life" was valid if objectives (as of general social
welfare) are considered; however, specific procedures (as
the limitation of crops) would only be judged consistent
with the "American way of life" by those who agreed with his economic theories. Hoover's acid statement before the Republican Women of Pennsylvania, who met in Philadelphia on May 4, 1936, required an answer, for the ex-President had said:

"In another sixty days the New Deal party will convene in this city, where American liberty was first proclaimed....I trust those gentlemen will bare their heads before Independence Hall. Under the invisible presence of the men who founded a nation that liberty might live, they should apologize to the American people." 110

110 Vital Speeches, 2: 556, June 1, 1936, "Constructive Alternatives."

Thus, Roosevelt attempted to square his cause with historical precedent as he proceeded to "write history" in Philadelphia. The implicit identification of his proposals with undeniable goals (reaffirming the faith of the
fathers, restoring the wider freedom and the American way of life) is accomplished by providing similar sentence positions for these ideas which are to be identified.\footnote{112}

\footnote{112}The sentence-elements which build these frameworks are these: "Philadelphia is a good city in which..." and "This is a fitting ground on which..." In the first sentence he refers to his own proposal; in the second sentence he places the policies which no one could deny as desirable. This identification is too subtle to arouse critical thought in the minds of a listening audience. Roosevelt used here one of the three types of "presumption" explained by Oliver, who points out that it imputes to the audience "the speaker's own ideas, as though he is but echoing what they already believe." (Op. cit., p. 248.) He strengthened his cause by achieving this identification for "when a new idea can be given an old and accepted tag, its chance of being accepted is greatly increased." (Ibid., p. 153.)

Thus, by careful guidance of the audience's attention by identification of the cause with venerated ideals, and by skilful word choice and arrangement, Roosevelt has established his first thought—that his audience is present on an important occasion.

\textbf{Economic freedom must be won.}

Roosevelt enforced this parallel of the struggle for political liberty in 1776 with the struggle for economic liberty in 1936 by analyzing into specific details one side of the analogy and then the other. He told the Revolutionary War story in terms applicable to the 1936
side of his analogy and then told the 1936 story in

113 He talked of "royalists" who held "special privileges" and who "put the average man's property and the average man's life in pawn to the mercenaries of dynastic power."

terms which carried over emotional values from their previous association, such terms as "dynasties,"

114 "That suggestion will be most effective which can call to its aid or appropriate the dynamic force of some other impulse that is already active or latent..." H. L. Hollingworth, Op. cit., p. 143.

"impressed into this royal service," "Minute Man of Seventy-six," and, especially, "economic royalists." This characterization had the power of a slogan in addition to its transferred emotional values.

115 Hollingworth spoke of the "popular craving for a terse slogan which will take the place of careful description, conceal the lack of real understanding, identify, and rally the devotees of a leader or party, and serve as a convenient challenge to the enemy. Political leaders..." Ibid., p. 145.

116 Frances Perkins declared that this challenging phrase had "marred the spirit of unity" at the Democratic Convention and spoke of the "resentment" that it caused. (Op. cit., p. 122) Oscar R. Ewing, once vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, brought out its lasting effect by including it in his list of Roosevelt's phrases which have now become a part of everyone's political vocabulary. New Republic, 114: 537, April 15, 1946, Supplement, "He was a party man."
Economic royalists have dominated.

The thought of this complex passage is simply this: concentration of industrial power, achieved especially through use of other people's money, had eliminated the private enterprise of Americans—particularly farmers, laborers and small business men—and had come to control, with government sanction, the working conditions and profits of these groups. 117

117The concentration of industrial power is shown by Dumond: "More than half of the corporate wealth was in the possession of 200 corporations, which were under the control of a few hundred men....Almost one-fourth of the total income of the nation flowed from the industrial process. The simple necessities of food, clothing and shelter for millions of people depended upon its uninterrupted operation." Op. cit., p. 296. As to speculation, "It is estimated that 90 per cent of the stock market transactions during the twenties were speculative rather than for investment purposes." Ibid., p. 299. As to use of other people's money, "People not only speculated with their own money, but unscrupulous financiers, occupying positions of public trust, gambled with the savings of the remainder." Ibid., Agricultural surpluses were not solved by the increased Republican tariffs of 1922 and 1930; labor's needs were not solved by ignoring the antitrust laws and the investigations of the Federal Trade Commission (Ibid., p. 331); small business men were not aided when Hoover vetoed the Wagner-Garner Relief Bill which would have permitted RFC loans to small business men and to individuals (Rauch, Op. cit., p. 20)

Although this industrial monopoly did exist, Roosevelt was wrong in implying that the whole impact of the depression 118 had been the result of this one factor
Between 1929 and 1932, the total physical output of goods was reduced 37 per cent; total labor income, 40 per cent; total property income, 31 per cent. In March, 1933 (with the monthly average of 1923-1925 as 100), the index of industrial production stood at 60; that of construction at 14; that of factory employment at 61; that of factory pay rolls at 38; that of wholesale prices (1926 as 100) at 60. The farmer's purchasing power was reduced 50 per cent." Louis M. Hacker, American Problems of Today, F.S. Crofts & Co., New York, 1938, p. 178.

However, Borah had pointed out the major part

Hacker pointed out that there were ten aspects of our economy which deserved consideration in the mounting of the depression, of which only four are concerned directly with concentration of capital. Ibid., pp. 179-191.

taken by "the remorseless exactions of monopoly" in the nation's sufferings, and the Republican Party had

Vital Speeches, 2: 592-593, June 15, 1936, "Monopoly and the Campaign."

placed an anti-monopoly plank in its platform. Thus, although the charge against concentration of wealth was not new, it was seldom made with such vigor.

The sources of the power of Roosevelt's attack on the "economic royalists" within the compass of this argument lay in its cumulative effect (listing the machinery of regimentation, detailing the groups affected,
specifying the results upon them); in its play upon the words "private" and "privileged;" in the vocal force.

---

Reassessment of "private enterprise" as "privileged enterprise" gained power through the similarity of opening sound in the two words. Genung declared, "In the impression of a thought descriptively, or in an aphoristic summary of truth, these adjuncts of sound become a natural aid to attention and memory. It is for this reason that we find them freely used in maxims, proverbs, and folk-phrases; they are like an application of poetic diction to common life." Op. Cit., p. 159.

with which he uttered his epithet, "economic royalists," and other phrases of similar import, as "the tools which the new economic royalty used to dig itself in"; and his localizing the very real conditions of the depression, though incorrectly, upon a single source. It is likely

---

Ewbank and Auer have explained that "the persuasive speaker should talk to his audience on the assumption that he and they are members of a group with like interests and worthy motives, engaged in defeating the efforts of an outsider representing hostile forces." (Op. cit., p. 269) Hollingworth pointed out that "In the fusion of heterogeneous elements of a population into an effective social group nothing is more potent than a common hatred or a common fear." (Op. cit., p. 145)

that Roosevelt's Democratic henchmen in Franklin Field and his adherents throughout the nation felt the power of these factors but did not criticize his logical reasoning.

When Roosevelt turned to the other premise of his hypothetical syllogism, he used a different
Political liberty was endangered. (Conclusion)
If citizens did not have economic freedom, political liberty was endangered. (Major premise)
Citizens did not have economic freedom. (Minor premise)

approach, gaining pathetic appeal by introduction of words of "an old English judge." Roosevelt's delineation of

Words similar to those quoted by Roosevelt were used by William Pitt in his speech on the India Bill in 1783; this English statesman, who was called to the bar in 1780 and had served on the western circuit, stated in his speech of advocacy: "Necessity is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves."

a "decent" living was effective through its utter simplicity of word-choice, by its use of contrast in

Of the thirteen words in this sentence-element only two have more than one syllable. These two—enough and something—are basic concepts which cannot be further simplified. All thirteen are Anglo-Saxon or Middle English. This quick turn to simple expression gave the sense of utter honesty. George H. Lewes in his essay on "Simplicity" pointed out: "Saxon words are words which in their homeliness have deep-seated power, and in some places they are the simplest because the most powerful words we can employ .... The selective instinct of the artist tells him when his language should be homely, and when it should be more elevated; and it is precisely in the imperceptible blending of the plain with the ornate that a great writer is distinguished. He uses the simplest phrases without triviality, and the grandest without a suggestion of grandiloquence." Foundations of English Style, Paul M. Fulcher, F.S. Crofts & Co., New York, 1928, pp. 109-110.

Frances Perkins recalled: "The words most often on his lips to describe what he regarded as the good
democratic society were: 'free,' 'fair,' and 'decent.'" Op. cit., p. 5.

"to live by" and "to live for" with enforcement by pause and changes of vocal pitch and force, and by the sheer pathetic power of the goals envisaged. 126 In Roosevelt's concluding expression of this idea he retained the group feeling by his repeated phrase "too many of us," keeping the designated group within the framework and security of the whole. But his condemnation of the out-group was biting in its prolonged repetition of the words "other people's" with its increasingly heavy emphasis falling upon the word elevated upon this framework. This appeal to the basic drive of self-preservation was enhanced by echoes of the Declaration of Independence to reinforce his claim of the basic nature of these denials of "life," "liberty," and "the pursuit of happiness."

The government has undertaken to end this tyranny.

Roosevelt offered the election of 1932 as proof of the "people's mandate" to end their troubles. 127 He


127 Although James T. Adams did not feel that the vote of 1932 constituted a "mandate," (Scribner's Magazine,
99: 138, March, 1936, "Roosevelt record, Has the President thought it through?") other writers feel that this concentration of 22,500,000 votes was, in truth, a "mandate" from the people. Morison and Commager, Vol. II, p. 588. Also Rauch, op. cit., p. 46.

interpreted this huge vote from many diverse elements in the country to mean that "they want direct, vigorous action." 128


He interpreted the unprecedented gain of nine supporters in the Senate and twelve in the House in the mid-term elections of 1934 as a "mandate" also. 129 And Roosevelt's concluding statement that "under that mandate it is being ended" would seem to be upheld by the rising business activity and the greater consumer prosperity, and the audience would not have been disposed to notice that coincidence had been substituted for causality in the argument, 130 although business would have. Regardless

130 Ewbank & Auer listed the acceptance of "specious argument" as one of the tendencies of man's emotionalized thinking. (Op. cit., p. 225) Hollingworth has pointed out man's desire to be "rational" but has declared that "Willingness to think is not to be confused with ability to think soundly or profoundly....He mistakes coincidence for proof, correlation for causality, confidence for necessity, publicity for expertness, and appearance for reality." (Op. cit., p. 118)
of the manner of statement at this point, it is believed that Roosevelt meant to assert the causal relationship, as he did later in the address, for it was basic to his stand in the campaign. 131

131 Hoover had declared in April, 1936: "Mr. Roosevelt is anxious that the American people shall believe that the nation was 'in ruins' when he took office....I hardly need restate the fact, now well established by disinterested economists the world over, that America was shaking itself clear of the depression, under its Republican administration in June-July, 1932." Vital Speeches, 2: 445, April 20, 1936, "Effects of the New Deal." Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that during the last days of February, 1933, various states declared bank holidays, and the problem became so severe that there was little justification for the claim that recovery had begun.

Roosevelt's vigorous assertion that "economic royalists" had recognized political freedom as the province of government but denied government the right to protect citizens economically avoided the more vital

132 Lewis H. Brown, president of the Johns-Manville Corporation, in a speech to the Chamber of Commerce at Washington, D.C., had labelled certain of the government's policies as "retarding" and "unsympathetic." Vital Speeches, 2: 484-485, May 4, 1936, "Industry." C. M. Chester, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, pointed out, in a radio address of March 30, 1936, specific directions in which industry's efforts to increase employment were being hampered by governmental threats and activities. Ibid., 2: 411, April 6, 1936, "Industry and Recovery."

problem of how much government restraint such protection
would take by concentrating attack on the denial of the right of any action whatsoever, a denial not made by his opponents. Sentence structure and vocal emphasis made

This diversion of the audience's attention from the true point of the argument was an effective use of "indirect suggestion." Robert T. Oliver explained that this method works best when the listener's "thought processes are so fully occupied with an irrelevant problem that the speaker's point can slip through without critical examination." Op. cit., p. 233.

This attack forceful.

Roosevelt's scorn was so concentrated on the words "nobody's business" that each word was preceded not only by a significant preparatory pause but by vocalization of the sound "ah" in which it seemed as though the presidential indignation was mounting in force to pounce upon the actual words. His charge was strikingly repeated in an antithetical statement, each part of which has a six-word element with difference only in the sharply contrasted words, "polling" and "market."

The accuracy of Roosevelt's analogy between the fight for political liberty in 1776 and the fight for economic liberty in 1936 should be examined. Though rhetorically strong, this analogy is not logically sound because of the basic differences in the two situations. The struggle for political liberty in 1776 was fought mainly against an external force, whereas the fight in 1936 was a struggle of readjustment within a unit of government. The defeat of England won political freedom for the
country; then the political freedom of the citizens within the country was won by inner adjustments. An analogy could have been more correctly made with the struggle to adjust the government of the United States to allow political freedom to the citizens, for here the play of group against group within the body politic could have been compared with the struggle between the "economic royalists" and the groups distressed by their use of power. Since Roosevelt drew the analogy between political freedom for the country as a whole and economic freedom for the individuals of the country, he has posed a comparison between non-comparable entities; he has used the word "freedom" in an equivocal sense and is thus guilty of fallacious reasoning. At one point his analogy drew him into direct misstatement, for he claimed that

"If the average citizen is guaranteed equal opportunity in the polling place, he must have equal opportunity in the market place."

It is clearly meant here that the struggle of 1776 had brought that "equal opportunity in the polling place," a statement neat for rhetorical effect but incorrect.

The analogy fails also on the test of causal connection. The general principle upon which the analogy is based may be stated thus: defeat of the designated enemy will eliminate the disastrous conditions and produce
freedom. The analogy claims that defeat of the "economic royalists" would eliminate the troublesome economic conditions and bring economic liberty. However, such an analysis makes the manifestations of the depression stem uniformly from this one cause, the concentration of power in the hands of the monopolies. Elliot V. Bell pointed out that Wall Street resented

"the Roosevelt thesis that big business constitutes a "dynasty" of "economic royalists" whose interests are opposed to those of the masses and the implication that this "dynasty" was responsible for the depression."

Such resentment is understandable since explanations of the depression ranged as widely as holding the causes to be foreign and declaring the occurrence but a happening to be expected in the business cycle. Hence, the argument that curtailment of the power of the "royalists" would end all these ills is hardly justifiable. Furthermore, the claim that this curtailment would bring economic liberty was hardly tenable when the method of procedure merely substituted government control for monopoly control. The analogy fails, then, on this second count, that the causal relationship between the terms did not hold true. However,
such specious argument was not so assessed, in all likelihood, by the emotionally-tuned listeners.

Roosevelt's concept of proof by clarification and interpretation was strikingly evidenced in his refutation of the complaint of the "royalists" that he sought to overthrow the institutions of America. 136 He attacked the source of this charge first, declaring the complaint a deceptive one by pointing out that their real dissatisfaction was with the curtailment of their power, an interpretation which was undoubtedly largely correct. Throughout these arguments, Roosevelt used terms of commendatory nature for his own policies and terms of derogatory nature for those of his opponents, 137 as, for

136 Eugene G. Grace, speaking at the American Iron and Steel Institute meeting in New York City, May 28, 1936, had said, "Shall freedom of initiative and freedom of enterprise survive, or shall our social and economic existence be dictated and controlled by Government?" Vital Speeches, 2: 678, August 1, 1936, "Industry and the Public."

137 Hollingworth has explained the effectiveness of this method: "In persuading an audience, then, one fundamental procedure is that of linking up the proposition to
be advanced with an atmosphere of desirability, or attaching to its antithesis a feeling tone of undesirability." Op. cit., p. 117.

example, his supporter would be a "Minute Man of seventy-six" and his opponent, an "economic royalist." The contrast was emphasized by use of vocal force and quality.

Praise of the platform adopted by the Convention whose member-delegates were among the thousands gathered before him in Franklin Field as "brave" and "clear" was strong pathetic appeal, for the listing of certain of the "inescapable obligations" of a modern government to its citizens appeals to emotions of love of family and home, desire for self-realization, and pity for the less fortunate. Such phrases as "the resolute enemy within our gates" gives a Biblical flavor to Roosevelt's language, a flavor entirely in keeping with the high moral tone of the whole address and proceedings. The pledge to continue the struggle was still in the crusading spirit; those present must have felt the surge of onward movement, but it is likely that many of the radio listeners felt that great enough changes had been made and were reluctant to move farther into reform. 138

138 Raymond Moley had pointed out this weariness in an address to the Advertising Federation of America in Boston on July 1, 1936; he had explained: "A recovering country
was getting tired of its medicine. As month after month of the hot summer of 1935 dragged on, a great weariness began to possess the public. People became confused, frightened, fed up with accusations, investigations, scoldings. Human nature began to refuse to stay on a crusading plane just as it had many times in the past. I believe that mood has become intensified and more widespread in the year just past." Vital Speeches, 2: 637, July 15, 1936, "The Future of Corporate Prophets."

This fight has given us understanding.

A characterization of the fight was demanded in such speeches as Steiwer's keynote address at the Republican Convention; the Senator had shouted, "For more than three long years we have had a government without political morality." Roosevelt met such a challenge directly,

claiming that the result of increased interest in government brought by "the defeats and the victories" was the

understanding that "the greatest guide of all is moral principle." He explained that his administration had used
"faith, and hope, and charity" as supports in the struggle, translating each term into a specific belief held. ^141 "Faith Roosevelt took the oath of office with his hand upon the Bible open to these verses. (Placard viewed upon the family Bible viewed in Hyde Park Library, August, 1947). Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt closed her first "My Day" article after the President's death with his favorite verse, "And now there abideth these three—faith, hope, charity, but the greatest of these is charity." Franklin D. Roosevelt, A Memorial, (Donald P. Geddes, editor), The Dial Press, New York, 1945, p. 84.

in the soundness of democracy in the midst of dictatorships" was implicit refutation of charges of distorting the American form of government. "Hope renewed because we know so well the progress we have made" repeated his claim that the recovery now in evidence had come through efforts of the administration. "Charity" he interpreted to mean helping men to help themselves with personal, sympathetic attention. His opponents would deny strongly that his policies holding back business from full recovery were achieving this goal.

Strong pathetic appeal is afforded by the claim that he sought to give government a "vibrant personal character." His trips about the nation to see the country "first-hand," his visits to public projects and C.C.C. camps—such activity gave validity to his claim. Forceful appeal to the relief workers in his audiences throughout
the nation lay in his declaration of the social value of
the individual to the nation.

Use of negative statement for strong denial and
for establishment of contrast occurs five times in the
presentation of this idea, giving the speaker a fullness
of picturization impossible with affirmative statement
only. Particularly effective is the final denial, cast in
metaphorical language, "We cannot afford, we cannot afford
to accumulate a deficit in the books of human fortitude."
In addition to the pathetic appeal of its declaration, it
contains implicit refutation of campaign challenges on
the issue of balancing the Federal budget.

He reiterated his fundamental policy of govern-
ment when he declared that his administration sought to
build "a temple out of faith and hope and charity" to
replace "the palace of privilege." The whole character-
ization of his "fight for freedom" is couched in moving
Biblical language.142 The emphasis on "love" as the

142 Oliver claimed that "The persuasive effect of
sheer stylistic excellence is tremendous....Apart even
from the idea it contains, an effective phrase is a
strong motivator of human conduct." Op. cit., pp. 244-
246.

answer to human ills may have originated in the Emersonian
influence 143 so strong upon Roosevelt; however, editorial
Emerson was referring to politics when he declared "Love would put a new face on this weary old world....Will you suffer me to add one trait more to this portrait of man the reformer. The mediator between the spiritual and the actual world should have a great prospective prudence." The Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston, 1883, Vol. I, pp. 239-242.

comment did not fail to notice his omission of the fourth cardinal virtue, prudence. Mention of that virtue would have been inconsistent in this address for two reasons: first, that Roosevelt's approach to the problem of social justice was that of bountiful, not prudent, government; and, second, that faith, hope and charity are warm-hearted, emotional virtues consistent with the mood of the audience and capable of inducing social facilitation.

Hollingworth pointed out that "the consolidation and integration of the audience depends not alone upon the actions of the leader, but also upon the contributory signs afforded constantly by the attitudes and expressions of each individual to his neighbor." Op. cit., pp. 147-48.
whereas prudence is a colder, more logical, more unattractive virtue involving judgment rather than goodwill, a virtue not consistent with the temper of the emotionally-stirred listeners in Franklin Field.

The impact of this argument does not lie in itself so much as in its position; coming after a violent attack upon one class of citizens, it declared the government ready to fight for the interests of all other groups. Charges of arousing class struggle were made against this alignment, as they had been made by Hoover and Steiwer

146 George Van Slyke wrote of the "harsh note of class appeal, spoken in flowery words and phrases as he assailed Royalists in industry whom he blamed for the continued depression and all our economic ills." *New York Sun*, July 25, 1936.

147 *Vital Speeches*, 2: 571-2; 275, June 15, 1936.

at the Republican convention, forgetful of the harsh attacks on monopolists made by Borah, Hoover and Landon. However, the pathetic appeal afforded by this


concentration of hatred made it an effective rhetorical usage.
This great cause is a sobering one.

Roosevelt had lifted his audience to a crusade against privilege; now, by word, thought and voice, he captured the momentum of this exaltation by dignifying the crusade itself. Roosevelt's delicacy of feeling as a "servant" of the cause showed humility; declaration of the cause as belonging to the people flattered their judgment and loyalty; explanation of willingness to learn from experiment implied courage and devotion.

Although the admission that "Presidents do make mistakes" was from Moley's pen, Roosevelt had expressed the same idea on more than one occasion previously. 

As Governor he had declared, "No government is infallible..."(The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. I, p. 462.) and in 1935 he had said to the farmers, "You and I know that mistakes were inevitable because it was a new field." (Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 484.)

This thesis, that action of any kind is better than no action, although not an accepted theory of government, was upheld through the pathetic appeal of the quotation from Dante, the neat balance of the sentence, and a significant circumflex pitch inflection on the word "warm." The following sentence was strongly asserted, and powerful in
its word-choice and its arrangement:

"Better the occasional faults of a government that lives in a spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference."

Vocal power on key words, economy of words, neatness of pictorial suggestion, careful balance of contrasted elements—these made Roosevelt's idea strong.

Roosevelt's characterization of his own errors as "occasional faults" would have been accepted with enthusiasm by his immediate audience and by many over the nation; his opponents would have contested the mistakes as being only "faults" and only "occasional." That Hoover's government was inactive was hardly the truth in the face of the Agricultural Marketing Act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the public works program; that it had "consistent omissions" was valid, as the farmer, the laborer and the unemployed knew.  

Roosevelt further dignified the cause by widening the group fighting for it and by showing its world relationships with the declaration, "This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny." The European situation, emphasized by the low, discouraged tone of its utterance, was delineated by general statement,
Biblical parallel, then a terse, unadorned sentence of restatement. His identification of the American economic struggle with the war for saving democracy for the world appealed to two of the strongest of men's desires—self-preservation, and self-respect.

Roosevelt's concluding words of acceptance did not omit the idea of the cause, the crusade, for he spoke of accepting the "commission" which they had "tendered" him. The next morning, those of the audience who read the newspapers found that their ovation to the President had drowned out his last two sentences: "I join with you. I am enlisted for the duration of the war." 152

152 News-Week, 8: 9, July 4, 1936.

Summary and Interpretation

Roosevelt's address in Franklin Field on June 27, 1936, was a highly effective political address. Speaking to 100,000 directly and to unseen millions by radio, he made a strong opening to one of the most effective stump-speaking campaigns in American history.

With both Republicans and Democrats aware that President himself was the real issue of the campaign, and
with rapid alteration of mass attitudes possible through the new medium of the radio, Roosevelt faced a task in 1936 which was intangible, evasive and constantly changing—the establishment of himself as the desired leader for the next term. Where other specific issues were at stake, his supporters could speak and write; where his personality and purpose were the issue, only he could properly impress.

His important speeches must be comparatively few, reasoned his political advisers, lest his influence diminish through familiarity, but each address must fit the need of a definite time, not only of a local but of the national audience. He must play locality, theme treatment of ideas, and manner of address like moves of pawns.

But Roosevelt, who was to accomplish this task of reselling himself to the American people, had a nation of vehemently divided listeners. He would be speaking to those eager for assurances from their President who had made his interest in their welfare real to them; he would be speaking at the same time to those who denied him not only accuracy of facts and their interpretation but even integrity of character.

For this address in acceptance of renomination, a speech not properly a part of the campaign but directly
related to it, Roosevelt needed to integrate the forces which would support him and to reduce the forces of the group challenged to the fewest and weakest possible. For this purpose, neither the issue of extension of Federal power nor financial conduct of government would be effective. He needed to take a position of attack rather than of defense. He was to speak in Philadelphia, the foundation city of our liberty. Hence, he made a vigorous attack upon the small group of finance-capitalists, urging Americans to fight for economic liberty as they had once fought for political liberty.

Ideas and Logical Proofs

Roosevelt struck at the basic problem of consolidating his forces throughout the country by declaring the importance of the occasion as a time for taking up together the attitudes toward new problems which had arisen in the nation.

He directed a strong attack upon the moneyed interests, labeling them "economic royalists" in his comparison of the fight for economic freedom to be fought in 1936 with the fight for political freedom which had been fought successfully in 1776. This comparison may well be criticized as to the entities it compares and to its use of causal relationship. Its power lay in its
designating as the foe the small group of capitalists which all other economic groups would find it easy to attack, and in its alignment of government and people in a common struggle against this labeled opponent.

The attack had two phases: the regimentation of the people by the "royalists"; the control of government by the "royalists." Although Republicans would deny that the latter had occurred in the Hoover administration, their anti-monopoly plank in the 1936 platform recognized the power of the first charge. This argument relative to the winning of economic freedom through the defeat of the "royalists," to which struggle the Democratic Party had just rededicated itself, was the only extended line of reasoning in the address. Two other ideas follow—characterization of the struggle as made thus far, and placement of the economic problem in its larger framework—but they serve merely as enforcement of the discussion concerning the economic struggle.

This simplification of argument was well adapted to the size of the audience and to the emotional pitch of these listeners. Though inherent in this problem, the question of how far government may go in striving to help win economic freedom without itself destroying the goal was wisely passed by; Roosevelt chose to keep the emphasis upon the goal to be achieved.
Ethical proofs

Although every successful use of pathetic proof brings a measure of ethical argument, Roosevelt also applied some more direct methods of pointing to his reputation, showing himself the "good man," and obtaining the good-will of his audience.

His reference to the "grave responsibility" which was still upon him as President, his indirect reference to his contact with world affairs, his declaration of the country's conquest of fear--these attested his reputation as an honored, successful leader, worthy of continued faith. The gratitude which he expressed to wide-spread groups for help and sympathy showed him as humble; the assessment of faith, hope and charity as "supports" in the cause stamped him as dedicated to high ideals; his declaration of government's feeling for the common man in adversity demonstrated his understanding and kindness.

The fact that his presence, voice and message were in key with the size of the audience and its preceding integration through music and applause solicited their good-will. On the other hand, his salutation to "my friends here and in every community throughout the land" enlisted their support through warm expression of
his own feeling.

Pathetic proofs

Roosevelt's early and direct statement of the purpose of the address as well as his implication that any report made to his audience would of necessity be candid, challenged their judgment. Even stronger motivative appeal lay in his clear differentiation of an opponent—the capitalist group—and his designation of his supporters as an army on crusade against that foe, newly dedicated to go forth again under the former banners.

The scriptural references, the allusion to Dante, the quotation from an "old English judge" tacitly respected their literary and spiritual attainments. The compliment to Philadelphia was linked to patriotic fervor, not only as residents, but for all Americans. Roosevelt's use of the epithet, "economic royalists," and the epigrammatic closing sentence—these short-cuts to thinking held motivative power for the huge, suggestible audience in Franklin Field and for Roosevelt supporters listening to the address by radio throughout the country.

Recognition of the worth of the individual and expressions of gratitude were especially powerful appeals
in an address which was given by Roosevelt the President and honored leader, rather than by Roosevelt the "farmer" or Roosevelt the "good neighbor," for concern shown by a person in high place is pleasing to the recipient.

The selfishness inherent in economic struggle was reinterpreted by Roosevelt; he showed this cause as the true cause of democracy not only for our nation but for the world, a concept which dignified the struggle in the eyes of the crusaders.

Arrangement

Having shown the occasion as important and the people as valued participants in a great cause, Roosevelt launched into his analysis of the necessity for this struggle, a discussion which took up almost half the address. His two final ideas were shorter and were motivative supports for his thesis. The progression of ideas was not so strong in this address as in many of his other speeches; before this audience he used a single theme tied more consistently throughout the address with high principles than in any other of the campaign.

Language

The dominant oratorical character of this address was heavily dependent upon the language used.
The smaller amount of colloquial language here than in other speeches, the repeated use of parallel structure, the consistent use of concrete imagery, the references to the Bible and to Dante, the echoes from the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address—these were elements with appeal in common for great numbers of people. Important was the use of the epithet for the opponent, a term easily remembered and strongly assertive of Roosevelt's basic theme. Denial of the oppositional idea, then reaffirmation of the favored one—this form of amplification provided the audience with fuller grasp of meaning than would the positive declaration alone.

**Delivery**

Roosevelt employed his flexible voice to bring out the idea of high matter considered in high company. In this address was less of the conversational, informal vocal approach than in any of his other addresses of the 1936 campaign. Here he resorted to the sustained, uplifted tone of the great leader, who, although presumably a humble, sincere man, was dedicated to the service of a cause greater than himself but, at the same time, cognizant of the welfare of the members of his army.

Changes in pitch, force, rate and quality of
voice combined to show his attitude of scorn of those who held economic freedom to be "nobody's business," and his condemnation of their speculative use of "other people's money." He used vocal change to clarify ideas, to represent attitudes toward ideas and to recommend favored ones for the acceptance of the audience. Certainly, his use of voice was an important element in the oratorical power of this speech.

Thus, Roosevelt, in this acceptance address, held to a simplified thesis, empowered it with concrete, cogent words in structures directed by the ideas expressed, and rendered the audience favorable to its acceptance by enhancing himself and themselves in their eyes by his ideas, voice and language. The power of this oratorical effort was demonstrated not only in the favorable reaction of the supporters of Roosevelt but also in the antagonism of those he designated as the foes of the country. Roosevelt had begun his request for reelection with a powerful presentation of himself as mighty leader and personal friend.

The Reactions to the Speech

Perhaps the most significant reaction to the speech as a whole was Roosevelt's own; Moley reported that
the President "was delighted with the triumphant reception of the speech." It is true that the immediate audience broke forth into applause thirty-four times during the address; they cheered him for ten minutes at the close.

Several writers mentioned his skilful use of emotional coloring. Raymond Clapper declared that "With a voice never more confident, never more commanding, never warmer in its sympathy, Roosevelt played upon his audience with one of the most skilful political addresses of our time... Each word was loaded with the subtle power of suggestion, designed to sap the force of every attack from his opponents."

Heywood Broun characterized the address as fiery: "Personally, I found no lack of fire in the address, even though Franklin D. Roosevelt at times seemed disposed to speak in parables. Still 'any stigma will do to beat a dogma,' and if the President chooses to resurrect Dante and use his name and fame to club Hoover over the head, I see no possible objection."
Mark Sullivan spoke of Roosevelt's "colorful personality," his "agility," his "high spirits and gayety and zest," and his "skill in using words for charm and allurement."  

George Van Slyke pointed out the "rounded and cultural intonations" of Roosevelt's radio delivery and said of the Philadelphia address:

"His speech in his best form was perfect in delivery, smooth, polished and magnetic, but carried a harsh note of class appeal....In characteristic generalities, his speech in every sentence had double meaning and now a month later the controversy still rages over what he meant and what are his ultimate purposes."  

That Roosevelt's tones were more measured in this address than usual caused some to ask, "A tone of defeatism?" and others, "A messianic tone?" However, Paul W. Ward, writing his "Washington Weekly" column, explained that this occurrence had no political significance, that

"In the great stadium where he spoke, the amplifiers down at the far end threw back his phrases at him seconds after they were uttered, and he had to affect a slow deliberateness in order to keep from seeming to himself at least to be making two speeches at one and the same time."
However important this physical interpretation may have been, it is certain that the "slow deliberateness" was eminently suited to the presentation of high sentiments to a huge audience.

Editorial comment pointed out the dangers of such an address. The Washington Post declared that the President had taken, in view of his weak record, the "politically sagacious" course in using an emotional approach, characterized the speech as one that "opened all emotional outlets...unloosed mob psychology and then stimulated it with a master hand," and warned severely that "it was the sort of speech which paves the way for fascism." The Washington Star claimed that Roosevelt had intentionally ignored the basic issue of spending, and suggested that the President's concentration on principles to which the people would be particularly loyal might be justified in the election verdict.
Herald Tribune commented on the speech as "an emotional harangue couched in sweeping generalities and centered upon a flaming appeal to prejudice," and argued that the foes it attacked were "merely straw men put up to provide a fictitious battle for campaign purposes."  ^162

^162 June 29, 1936.

Reactions to Roosevelt's acceptance address appearing in public speeches made during the following week differed widely. Raymond Moley, Roosevelt's ex-adviser, made no direct comment in his address before the Advertising Federation of America, Boston, Massachusetts, July 1, 1936, on the address for which he had made rough notes but with the purport of which he was not in sympathy; ^163 however, he pointed out, as he had done previously, that the public was weary of battle, and added that it was "getting tired now of war as a figure of speech." ^164 Walter Lippmann ejaculated that the

^163 He called it an "oratorical Gryphon" because of the widely different ideas put together in it; he felt that the President was pursuing a "policy of negation" whereas he wanted a campaign on issues of policy. After Seven Years, pp. 342, 348.

Philadelphia address showed that Roosevelt had shifted his position to adopt the policies of earlier American progressives, that he had taken over the words, slogans and principles that Hoover, Borah, Odgen Mills, Knox and Hearst had used against him; Lippmann reasoned that this shift in position was a reassuring example of American institutions. He declared:

"We have seen the most powerful Administration in our history...checked at the height of its popularity, first by a court of law, then by a change of popular sentiment, and finally, we have seen it driven, under the weight of free criticism, to change its purposes and its program."165

But Ogden Mills was much aroused by the implications of the address, for he did not believe Roosevelt's condemnation of monopolies sincere. Mills told the Women's National Republican Club in New York City, June 30, 1936,

"Let Mr. Roosevelt disavow NRA and all it stood for, and I'll believe his platform declaration against monopoly. But until he does, only the gullible will be fooled."166

Mills did not agree with Lippmann that the danger to the
American institutions was past, declaring, "They would have us believe that the people must surrender their liberty, the better to preserve it." He also pointed out that the "new dynasties" had grown up prior to 1932, during the last four years of which time Roosevelt had been governor of New York State, and that he had not destroyed them or limited their power. Further, he argued, purchasing power had nearly doubled in the thirty years preceding 1932, a fact tending to bring out the question that perhaps Roosevelt was "conjuring up these dark forces to justify his own revolutionary reaching for power." Mills denied that the adequate protection of the citizen's welfare was really the issue, claiming that the question really was that of governmental intervention and paternalism. Alfred M. Landon, in his acceptance address at Topeka, Kansas, July 23, 1936, showed this same fear of the concentration of governmental function in the Chief Executive. He may well have been answering Roosevelt's version of America's destiny when he pictured his vision of America's manifest destiny, adding that all could be accomplished "within the principles under which this nation had grown to greatness." Direct support
came to the President's declaration of war on monopoly from John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, in his NBC broadcast on July 6, 1936: Lewis immediately declared war on the "omnipresent overlords of steel."  

When Colby Chester, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, addressed the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia, July 10, 1936, he pointed out the heavy responsibilities of corporate management, and closed with a plea which probably stemmed from Roosevelt's attack on business:

"On behalf of American industry we ask a truce to fault-finding and indictment and a new day of tolerance, understanding, and mutual helpfulness."  

These reactions from labor and industry were fore-gone conclusions from past policies of the administration.

Thus, Mr. Roosevelt's acceptance address, seems to have met the situation skilfully, winning the fervent
acceptance of the immediate audience, satisfying the requirements of the favoring groups, and stimulating the antagonism of the disaffected groups. Mark Sullivan commented:

"A general judgment is that President Roosevelt, by his acceptance speech at the close of the Philadelphia convention, won a certain advantage of position. By the eloquence and finish of his performance he, so to speak, took the psychological offensive."

[Sullivan contrasted the qualities of the two major presidential candidates and pointed out the possibility of Mr. Landon's "simplicity" drawing many voters to him; he argued,

"Who can say certainly that the country will necessarily prefer the candidate who happens to have the more engaging traits of personality?...It may be that a large part of the public feels a psychological hunger for a plain man."

The validity of such a suggestion is obvious. Especially in a campaign in which the incumbent understood correctly that his personality and habits of action were the crux of the problem and in which he proposed to discuss
"attitudes toward problems" rather than the problems themselves was this problem of psychological reaction important. The acceptance address seems to have met the situation posed by the audience and the occasion with the effect which the President had sought.
Drought struck the Great Plains again in June, 1936, and the problem of agriculture was emphasized as of major importance in the campaign. By July 6 it had assumed such alarming proportions that the President took direct control of drought relief activities, asking personal reports daily. On July 22 he established a drought area committee to study conditions anticipatory to his conferences with groups of governors. The most important of these conferences was the one to be held with governors of seven Midwest states in Des Moines, Iowa, on September 1.

The President reached Bismarck, North Dakota, on August 27, 1936, on his tour of the drought areas. He answered Republican Chairman Hamilton's Bismarck charge.
of drought politics at a press conference, but he opened

2"It is a very great disservice to the proper administration of any government to link up human misery with partisan politics." New York Times, August 5, 1936.

his extemporaneous remarks in that city with an explanation of the reason for his visit:

"As you know, I came out here to see things with my own eyes. I felt that I could learn a lot more by coming out than by just reading blueprints and reports back in Washington." 3

3The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol V, p. 299.

Although the President denied having political purposes in his tour, yet the effect of his personal contact with the people in many states cannot be denied. 4 Reiterating the

4Charles W. Hurd analyzed his trip thus: "Although President Roosevelt has insisted that the trip is not political--and there is no question regarding his sincerity--it might well rank as a first-class example of the manner in which a practical statesman demonstrates his interest in the welfare of a people. The value of such a trip, regardless of motive, two months before an election, is inestimable, especially when every community in the region is benefiting by relief jobs supplied for the needy, when the credit needs of farmers are being handled and when a dramatic presentation has been given plans for long-time rehabilitation." New York Times, August 30, 1936.

interdependence of the country, he personalized his approach to the crowds who gathered about the rear platform
with his own interest in their welfare and his promises for the future. He gathered support at every train-

5 At Aberdeen, South Dakota, on August 28, 1936, the President said, "You have a great problem before you—not just taking care of the immediate needs caused by the drought this year, for we are going to take care of that. I have been thinking more about the future, for I want to see South Dakota continue to grow and prosper....I shall take back to Washington with me the picture of a whole lot of people with courage, with their chins up, who are telling me that they are going to see it through. And I am going to help." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol. V, pp. 307-8. At Huron, South Dakota, on the same day, he said, "I am grateful to you for the attitude you are taking." Ibid., p. 309.

6 These people of the farm areas had had repeated proof of Roosevelt's willingness to come to their aid by executive order, and the possibility of further aid after

7 One of the President's last acts before leaving the East was to sign an executive order increasing from $200 to $400 the maximum loan to individual farmers from the Farm Credit Administration for winter seed. With help from
both the Resettlement Administration and the Works Progress Administration it was likely that five hundred thousand families would be receiving drought aid of some kind before the winter months. *Washington Star*, August 24, 1936.

his trip through the drought area was not remote. During the drought trip the President made excursions by motor into the country at seven points and talked directly with the farmers. 8

8 "In my conversations with these farmers I inquired as to the condition of their crops and livestock, feed and water supplies, their drought losses, their credit requirements and the need for work relief and other forms of rehabilitation necessary to carry them through the winter months and to get them started at producing again." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol. v., pp. 294-295.

He held five major conferences, the largest and most important one being held in Des Moines, Iowa, September 3, 1936. There the President held a meeting with the delegations from each of the states, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, and Minnesota; Landon and his Kansas delegation were the third group to confer with the President for Kansas was third among the states represented in the order of admission to the Union. 9 Landon's suggestions followed the pattern of

9 Robert Wilson raised the question of politics in the casual placement of the Republican nominee and his delegation as third in the list of governors "as if he
were merely governor of Kansas and not also the choice of the Republican party for President." Des Moines Register, September 3, 1936.

those he had made to Roosevelt in 1933 and again in 1934; they also were similar to the report of the Great Plains Drought Area Committee. Newspaper reporters had made

much of this meeting of the candidates; however, the actual occurrence was without political fanfare. Nevertheless, two implications of the situation were important: first, Landon was making a report to a higher authority; second, Landon's program suggested no radical departures from the Presidential policy it might be supposed to replace.

Hence, the conference acted to increase the power of Roosevelt's candidacy. The President and his party then returned to Washington exuberantly, treating their Republican opponents with condescending tolerance.

On September 6 President Roosevelt gave a homey and personal report of his "journey of husbandry" in a Fireside Chat to the nation. He pointed out that every Governor with whom he had talked was "in full accord" with
his program of help for the farm families, tacitly assuring the nation that even his opponent approved his farm policies. On September 21 the President announced a crop insurance committee; neither political party had included this plan in its platform. At once Landon made public that part of his farm speech (planned for delivery in Des Moines, Iowa, on the following day) which dealt with crop insurance. 12

12The speech included these words: "I am now going to mention a subject that is in neither platform—crop insurance. It is a question in which we have long been interested in Kansas. In fact, some of our Republican leaders in farm legislation have been in the forefront in working on it....I believe that the question of crop insurance should be given the fullest attention." New York Times, September 23, 1936.

At a press conference Secretary Wallace denied that the President's creation of the special committee on crop insurance was timed to "steal the show" from Governor Landon's announcement, and professed his ignorance of the Republican candidate's plan to discuss the matter at Des Moines. 13 The agricultural policy tangle was thus thoroughly confusing to the farmers. 14


14Senator Dickinson of Iowa had pointed out in early July that the drought was demonstrating the "folly" of the
New Deal agricultural policy to farmers in Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska and South Dakota. New York Times, July 8, 1936. Later, ex-Governor Lowden of Illinois, whose views were of great weight in the farm belt, commented that the reaction among farmers to Landon's Des Moines and Minneapolis speeches had been "very favorable." Ibid., September 28, 1936. James A. Hagerty. George Gallup showed that neither Landon's nor Roosevelt's trips through the country had changed many ballots. After Roosevelt's drought inspection trip his vote remained the same in North and South Dakota but increased in Iowa. Washington Post, September 20, 1936.

Another factor important in September, 1936, was the violence of attacks being made upon the President. Those of Gerald K. Smith and Father Coughlin demanded no answer, but the charge of the Republican vice-presidential candidate, Frank Knox, made in an address at Allentown, Pennsylvania, on September 8, that no insurance policy or savings account was safe, did not go unanswered. The President called six leading insurance company executives into conference; later these men issued a public statement that assets and policies were greater than in 1932. Also, the "Red" blast from the Hearst publications was not ignored. Over Stephen Early's name the President denied in the newspapers of the country (the Hearst-controlled
papers included) that he desired any Communistic support.16

16 Turner Catledge pointed out that Roosevelt's recognition of the Hearst charge "may have been a 'fumble' more or less costly, in dignifying the charges." New York Times, September 27, 1936.

Shifting of party allegiance began early in 1936. Smith's Liberty League speech in January was only a first striking defection.17 Democrats from seventeen southern

17 Alva Johnston, drawing his conclusions from the calculations of the Democratic analyst, Emil Hurja, thought that the swing toward Roosevelt began with Smith's Liberty speech and that, "The public, according to many observers, likes Roosevelt better today because he has failed in the role of an earth shaker, and because it believes that, with the Supreme Court carefully watching over his steps, he will become a greatly improved leader ..." Saturday Evening Post, 208: 74, June 13, 1936. 'Prof.' Hurja, the New Deal's Political Doctor."

and border states held a "Grass Roots Convention" in Macon, Georgia, four days after Al Smith's address, for the purpose of denouncing the President's actions as subversive to their interests; Governor Talmadge's radio address attacked the President so personally that the Federal Communications Commission ordered an examination made of the attack.18 On September 10, the pro-Roosevelt

18 Literary Digest, 121: 5, February 8, 1936.

Democrats of seven southern states demonstrated their
loyalty to Roosevelt at a "Green Pastures Rally" in Charlotte, North Carolina, and 35,000 drenched listeners saw a rainbow arch across the sky as Roosevelt came forward to defend New Deal policies for Southern cotton.  

-Raymond Clapper commented that Roosevelt had not

"changed the name of the Democratic party, but under his hand its complexion has been altered until it is in fact a new party, dominantly farmer-labor in character."  

Such realignment of forces naturally led to the formation of new parties. Labor's Non-Partisan League, with a sub-organization of State Leagues, was established in April, 1936. Strong elements in the Republican party urged the selection of a coalition ticket, suggesting Newton Baker, Lewis Douglas, Senator Byrd or ex-Governor Ely (anti-New Deal Democrats) as possibilities for the vice-presidential nomination. One of the most colorful groups, organized in midsummer, 1936, was that formed by the adherents of Lemke (North Dakota Congressman), Dr. Townsend
(who led an old-age pension group), Father Coughlin (who had established a Union of Social Justice) and Gerald K. Smith (who had taken over the leadership of Huey Long's Share-the-Wealth organization). Great differences of opinion existed over the vote-getting power of this "Union Party." In August forty-two anti-New Deal

21 David Lawrence admitted its possible appeal to agricultural states but questioned its ability to appeal to labor. (New York Sun, June 20, 1936) A month later Duncan Aikman prophesied that "the Unionists should poll one of the most impressive third-party votes in American history." (New York Times Magazine, July 26, 1936, p. 6, "Lemke's New Party.")

Democrats (such men as Reed, Ely, Colby and Breckenridge) met, adopted the name of "National Jeffersonian Democrats" and summed their grievances cryptically. 22 A group of

22 They declared: "The Democrats of the nation see today a President calling himself Democratic...turning his back upon the party platform...and replacing the doctrines of Democracy with the tenets and teachings of a blended communism and socialism....This is more than a deviation which can be corrected, or a lapse which can be cured, or an honest mistake which can be forgiven. It discloses a perversion of heart and spirit which can neither be remedied or condoned....We will therefore not support for reelection the candidates of the Philadelphia convention." (News-Week, 8: 20, August 15, 1936)

right-wing Socialists, under the leadership of Louis Waldman, left their organization, called themselves the "People's Party" and declared their decision to enter this
campaign with the determination of forwarding the forces of social progress against the forces of reaction. On

23 Felix Bruner reported that Roosevelt welcomed this socialist bloc and characterized their statement as a clear and succinct interpretation of the "paramount issue." Washington Post, August 21, 1936.

September 11, one hundred eighteen leading liberals met to form a nonpartisan band for the reelection of President Roosevelt, calling themselves the "Progressive Party."

Looking beyond these changes of party allegiance and these eager attempts to determine the public mind, Dorothy Thompson prophesied in mid-September, 1936, that Roosevelt would be reelected. Her reasoning was that the course of history lay in the direction of an active government and that the majority of American people wanted this type of government. She denied that relief funds and business recovery were primary reasons, declaring,

"He will not win for his achievements, nor for his personality, not for his radio voice, not for his statesmanship, but because he has shown him-
self more keyed to the temper and the yearnings of the world as it is today." 25

Six years later, after the voters of November, 1936, had registered their clear decision, two of the best historians of the day, confirmed Miss Thompson's analysis:

"When party passions and personal antipathies have disappeared, it will be easy to see how deeply rooted in the American tradition was the Rooseveltian philosophy and how familiar the Rooseveltian methods. ... The legislation of the Roosevelt administration, then, was an attempt to catch up with the political lag of well-nigh twenty years and articulate government to economy." 26

International affairs could not be ignored by Presidential action in the late summer of 1936. 27 On

27 The U.S. Kane was bombed by plane off the coast of Spain on August 30, 1936. From Rapid City, South Dakota, the President authorized Secretary Hull to send "representations" to both sides of the warring factions." New York Times, August 31, 1936.

July 31 Roosevelt had represented the United States on a visit to Quebec, Canada; he pointed out the "living miracle" of the deep friendship of the two countries, addressing his audience in French as well as in English. 28
The urbanity, the very stature of such a representation by the head of the American government could not have failed to elicit a feeling of pride among the American people. R. W. Seaman had pointed out "That English taste is several notches higher than American taste is generally taken to be as self-evident as the first five clauses of the Declaration of Independence." The American Mercury, 35: 129, June, 1935, "Don't Bow Down to the English." James Bryce had referred to the hunger of the American people for great men. The American Commonwealth, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1899, p. 501. Colonel Starling declared, however, that in Franklin D. Roosevelt, "The American, after a great many growing pains, had come of age." Starling of the White House, p. 325.

Then, on August 14, 1936, Roosevelt had spoken before 25,000 cheering listeners at Chautauqua, New York, explaining America's stand for peace and neutrality, and declaring in memorable words, "I have seen war.... I hate war."29 This declaration of the American stand for peace was rated as an effective message for both our country and foreign nations.30 Rumors that Roosevelt was to call the

28The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol V, p. 289.

30Oswald G. Villard, who did not always commend the President, declared that this address was "by all odds the best speech which the President has made on the subject of peace...." The Nation, 143: 242, August 29, 1936. The New York Times characterized the speech as "on a high level of statesmanship and moral fervor." August 15, 1936.
heads of the large nations together for a world peace conference argued the President a world leader.

Thus, in late September, Roosevelt was ready to drop his "non-political" campaign and become "political" in earnest. His opponent had begun earlier, swinging into the Midwest on his first tour after he had opened his campaign at his birthplace, West Middlesex, Pennsylvania.

Twenty thousand persons heard him along the route in Colorado and Nebraska, and cheered him. New York Times, August 21, 1936, James A. Hagerty. He took with him a group of Kansan advisers who composed "a home-spun troupe which should make friends for Mr. Landon. As a piece of political dramatizing, it is good." Ibid., August 23, 1936, Arthur Krock.

He was variously received in the East: warmly in his rear platform talks and the speech at Chautauqua, rather coldly at Buffalo. Ibid., August 30, James A. Hagerty.
candidate as a

"substantial person....He is no rabble rouser. His radio addresses reveal him for exactly what he is—a modest, hesitant rather inarticulate man in his forties, amazed and a bit frightened at the sudden click of the white spotlight that beats upon him. He is not faking when he reveals that strange, embarrassed note in his radio voice. He is under a strain. The spotlight is new to him."35


candidate Landon's ability to "convey an impression of sincerity" was considered his strongest asset; he was handicapped by a delivery that lacked polish, gestures that were awkward, timing that did not allow the audience to applaud.36 Although the speech lessons, which he had begun in January, had brought some improvement, they had not made him an orator.37 Nevertheless, Landon was not


Few gestures, rapid speech, inadequate length of pauses, loss of eye contact in reading his copy—these characterized the speech of Landon in late July. New York Times, July 24, 1936. This comment was made in reference to his acceptance speech of July 23: "To the radio audience, he seemed a somewhat remodeled Alf M. Landon. A succession of speaking lessons had taught him to lower his tone, slacken his tempo, and emphasize occasional
completely inadequate, for he in his Chicago address of October 9, brought the crowd to its feet with his "biting peroration," 38 Raymond Clapper pointed out at the opening of the campaign that Landon, lacking "oral showmanship", would impress the public mind "through actions, rather than words, actions such as his quick stroke in revising the platform." 39 Facing this little-known opponent, the Democrats began with the theory that "the correct strategy was to insure, if possible, that the candidate of the opponents should not be built up to an inspiring figure." 40

Thus the forces were drawn in late September. The Democrats were offering the electorate a candidate who
had directed the government during the period in which recovery had come and who now seemed to take world problems in his stride, a candidate with powerful speaking ability and direct, personal charm. The Republicans were offering a "Grass Roots" candidate who had been a successful governor of his home state, who had none of the power of the genuinely accomplished speaker but who impressed audiences with the sincerity of his ideas.

The similarities in the party platforms as drawn at the conventions--similarities in attacks on monopoly, in the desire for Civil Service changes, reduction of expenditures, aid to agriculture and the unemployed, in the possibility of Constitutional reform--had been strengthened by the candidates' stand on crop insurance. The major differences lay in the question of governmental economic controls and in the emphasis upon state and local administration of relief. No matter how detailed the discussion of specific governmental policies, it was likely that the electorate felt that the question for decision was this: should government do so much for the citizens and spend so much in the doing?

The Audience

At Syracuse, New York, in 1936, for the first
time in American history a President of the United States addressed a state political convention. One thousand delegates \(^{41}\) had come from the districts of New York State for the two-day nominating convention held on September 28 and 29 in Syracuse. The largest single delegation was the Tammany group, nearly five hundred strong. \(^{42}\) Residents of Syracuse joined the delegates in large numbers, filling the 4,600 seats of the Jefferson Street Armory Convention Hall for an hour before the President arrived. Ten thousand others who had packed the drill shed and the armory courtyards heard the President's speech over a loudspeaker system. \(^{43}\)

The initial plan of broadcasting the President's address over a state-wide hookup only from 10:30 to 11:00 had been abandoned after arrangements had been completed because of Roosevelt's decision to discuss national rather than state issues. \(^{44}\) Thus, arrangements were made to

\(^{41}\) New York Herald Tribune, September 29, 1936, Lamoyne A. Jones.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., September 28, 1936, Denis T. Lynch.

\(^{43}\) Ibid., September 30, 1936, Lamoyne A. Jones.

\(^{44}\) Ibid., September 28, 1936, Lamoyne A. Jones.
broadcast the speech over the country-wide networks of the National Broadcasting Company and the Columbia Broadcasting System. Although the true extent of the radio audience is unknown, James Farley was confident that the address would attract unusual attention, not only because of its precedent-breaking nature but because of its content. It is indeed likely that the address was widely heard over the nation because the public, which had been reached through widespread "non-political" activities, would have been much interested in hearing the opening shafts of the "political" campaign. The

A rough account of his acts and utterances since the conventions would show that the has made fully fifteen formal speeches, all broadcast; has spoken informally to various-sized groups at least 40 times; has covered about 10,000 miles by train and auto; has traveled through nearly half of the 48 states; has appeared before audiences totalling perhaps a million, and has been heard over the radio by just about every one." Literary Digest, 122: 6, October 6, 1936.
national audience had been reached in a multitude of ways during July and August; a trailer caravan of 60 vehicles had carried the Democratic slogans to the country;\(^4^8\) both

\(^4^8\) Each vehicle had a phonograph for playing "canned" speeches, a radio receiving set for picking up political broadcasts for the loud-speaker systems, two campaign speakers, and this slogan: "For Opportunity, Security, and Freedom, Reelect Roosevelt and Garner." \(\text{New York Times, August 2, 1936.}\)

major parties had spent large sums of money on motion pictures,\(^4^9\) and on radio programs which would serve their political purposes.\(^5^0\) With Pennsylvania, the Midwest, and

\(^4^9\) Ibid., Russell Owen.

\(^5^0\) "This year it is estimated that the Republicans will spend between \$750,000 and \$1,000,000 for radio and the Democrats just as much as they think they need to, but probably about \$500,000." Ibid.

the Northwest uncertain ground for Roosevelt, the Democratic National Committee put NBC microphones before the governors of Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska and Oregon in early August to answer Landon's acceptance address; they pigeonholed him neatly as "a foggy thinker, a rank opportunist, a champion of business greed, an anti-laborite, and a beguiler of farmers."\(^5^1\)
The *New York Times* pointed out that it was generally agreed that an unusually large number of citizens had not yet decided how to vote, and suggested that many were taking it upon themselves to draw up the issues upon which they would make their decision.  

Although Edwin C. Hill claimed that there was "little doubt that the President's popularity has declined appreciably from what it was four years ago," Raymond Clapper pointed to the American Institute of Public Opinion polls of the spring of 1936, which showed Roosevelt with about 55% of the votes, to support his conclusion that Roosevelt was showing about the strength he had had in 1932. George Gallup pointed out a shift away from the President after Landon's nomination.
but his polls showed Roosevelt taking the lead again in August. On the other hand, the Literary Digest poll

56 He concluded "Both major parties are likely to concentrate their heaviest fire in the present campaign in five states—New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan and Ohio," Washington Post, August 23, 1936. The following week Gallup announced an analysis of shift-votes, pointing out that the commonest cause for a switch to Landon was government waste and extravagance, and to Roosevelt, his stand for the "common man." Ibid.

gave Landon the lead with thirteen states to Roosevelt's eight in the fourth week of its course. 57 Drew Pearson

57 Literary Digest, 122: 7, September 26, 1936.

and Robert Allen pointed out that probably never had so many straw votes been taken before an election. 58 Thus,

58 They listed these polls: the Crossley Poll, conducted for the Hearst newspapers, showing Landon ahead; the Scripps-Howard poll in Ohio, giving Roosevelt a slight margin; the Baltimore Sun poll, conducted in the State of Maryland and reaching every registered voter, showing Roosevelt with more than 60% of the votes; the American Press Association and the Publishers' Autocaster Service, conducted with three thousand weeklies in rural communities, giving Landon the lead; other newspaper polls. Washington Herald, October 7, 1936.

Roosevelt spoke in Syracuse, New York, before an immediate audience of Democrats but in a State whose electoral votes were not certain for his support, and to a national audience which had been open to widely different
appeals and was not yet settled as to its allegiance.

The delegates had been an apathetic group during their two days of meeting. Strong criticism of the selection of David Dubinsky and Sidney Hillman as Democratic Presidential electors was heard in the Syracuse Hotel lobbies, but no fight took place on the convention floor. James Farley’s address on the opening afternoon was not well attended by the delegates; all the early

sessions proceeded in a rather disinterested fashion.

Editorial comment declared, "This Democratic convention's business is to say 'yes' at every cue, with all the choral harmony and hilarious volume that characterized the Philadelphia symphony." (Ibid., September 28, 1936).

This cool, listless group of delegates gave but little applause to the most florid oratory except at the end of the spirited defense of Roosevelt and the vitriolic attack on Landon made the first evening by Senator Robert Wagner. Although Governor Lehman was applauded, the

Ibid., September 29, 1936, Lamoyne A. Jones.
parade of delegates after his renomination lasted only eight minutes instead of the usual half hour.  

62 Ibid., September 30, 1936, Denis T. Lynch.

delegates—throttled in their disaffection over the Bubinsky-Hillman "united front" alliance, instructed to soft-pedal the New Deal and to replace state issues with attacks on the opposing national candidates, representing a rural and urban constituency which had reelected this year's presidential nominee as their governor in 1930 by the great plurality of 725,000 votes—went through the convention procedure spiritlessly.

During these two days the people of Syracuse "took the whole business pretty lightly" but on the evening of the President's speech they showed a sudden interest, jammed the convention hall by 6:30 o'clock, and swarmed into courtyard and drill shed.  

63 Earlier in the day

63 Ibid., Lamoyne A. Jones.

Roosevelt had laid the cornerstone at the dedication of the Medical College in Syracuse and had solicited the good will of the city by intimate reminiscences and by laudatory statements 64 which were strong in both pathetic

64 Roosevelt spoke of his pride in being an honorary
alumnus, of his visit at the opening of the Psychopathic Hospital, of his familiarity with problems of the city (making the State Fair pay, and removing the tracks in the middle of the city). He lauded the College for its record of having given the first doctor's degree in America to a woman. He referred to the pride of the University, of the citizens of Syracuse and of the State of New York in the work which had been done at the Center. The *Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, vol. V, pp. 380-382)

and ethical appeal and would have disposed any listener to a fair hearing for the speech of the evening.

Thus, the President spoke on September 29, 1936, to one thousand delegates from the districts of New York State, to additional thousands of Syracusans eager to see as well as hear the President in his first real political speech of the campaign, and to millions of individuals and groups listening beside their radios all over America. The temper of the delegates regarding the "united front" alliance showed their uneasiness on the Communist issue in their own state; doubtless great numbers of people in other parts of the country had been goaded into some degree of concern that Roosevelt meet the Communist issue.

Regardless of their stand on individual issues,

65 Landon had declared the New Deal to be a step away from the American way of life, as in his Portland, Maine, address of September 12, 1936. *New York Times*, September 13, 1936. However, Democratic strategists felt that his
charge had not been sufficiently definite to arouse the average man; the Hearst attack, on the other hand, they felt to be graphic enough to be dangerous. *New York Herald Tribune*, September 29, 1936, John C. O'Brien.

Roosevelt's radio listeners could probably be most effectively described in relation to their basic emotional orientation for or against the candidate himself.

The immediate setting of the Speech

The President having entertained the State leaders at dinner aboard his train, entered the convention hall at 8:45 P.M. His arrival set off a "wildly enthusiastic outburst unlike anything that had occurred since the convention started." Toward the end of the cheering

66 Lamoyne A. Jones reported: "Shouts and cheers sprang from the audience even before the President, Mr. Lehman and Mr. Farley arrived. From 8 P.M. there were impromptu singing bees conducted in various parts of the jammed hall, while the 108th Infantry Band entertained the crowd from its balcony with all the old-fashioned songs and the omnipresent Roosevelt campaign ditty, 'Happy Days are Here Again.' A women's drum and bugle corps paraded about the hall playing a little of everything." *Ibid.*, September 30, 1936.

67 The announcer's voice rose above the applause and cheers with these words: "Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. The following program is presented under the sponsorship of the Democratic National Committee. The
President of the United States makes his first formal address in his campaign for reelection to the presidency and for this address he has come to the city of Syracuse in his native state of New York. We are speaking to you from the New York State Armory in Syracuse." Cheers rang above the announcer's voice. "And in this big hall has been packed to overflowing with persons who have come to hear the President. And now we present his Excellency, Herbert H. Lehman, governor of New York, who was renominated this afternoon by this convention for a third term as Chief Executive of the Empire State. The Governor will present the President. Governor Lehman." Among the cheers and shouts were heard the words, "All right." This announcement was taken from the recording made for the writer by Audio-Scriptions, Incorporated.

then the introduction by Governor Lehman:

"Hello, delegates! I have the privilege and the high honor of presenting a former governor of this state, the man who changed despair into hope and confidence and restored prosperity to our country, (prolonged cheers and applause) a great American (applause) the President of the United States."68

68 Ibid.

Again the crowd bursts into a tremendous ovation. 69 During

69 The roars of "exuberant anticipation" were likened by one reporter to the emotion felt by the audience when a valiant posses in a Western movie is thundering to succor the beleaguered hero. Time, 28 : 13, October 12, 1936.

the prolonged applause and the exciting rumble of drums, the air waves caught the words of one member of the audience, rising out of the confusion and uproar, "A great
Roosevelt beamed upon the enthusiastic auditors, unfolded his manuscript, looked up and smiled again as he began his speech with an appropriate extemporaneous remark.

The audience within the convention hall had the advantage of being able to see as well as to hear the President and also to appreciate and catch the fervor of the thousand delegates whose apathy had been exchanged for a contagious hilarity. The close-packed thousands in the court-yard and drill shed heard only the transmitted address, as did the groups and individuals listening by radio throughout the country, but the physical proximity of the listeners to each other and to the unseen speaker and his immediate audience within the hall increased the power of social facilitation. The President's third audience—the radio listeners—had neither the sight of the speaker nor the presence of the crowd to augment their reactions, but the description of events by the announcer and the snatches of cheering and music which reached them over the air may well have...

The announcer said, "This is the second tremendous ovation that the President has received since coming to the New York State Armory here in Syracuse. His arrival
on the platform a few minutes ago with Mrs. Roosevelt was the signal for an enormous cheering and applause—a tremendous ovation. And now he has just been introduced by the Governor of New York State. He is waving to the crowd and his address will start in just one moment." Text of this announcement was taken from the rerecording made by Audio-Scriptions, Incorporated, for the writer.

exerted a favorable-to-Roosevelt influence upon all individual radio listeners who were not so severely opposed to the candidate as to be offended by this exhibition in his honor.

At the close of the speech the convention hall audience broke into cheers and continued applause, as in all likelihood did the thousands outside the hall. The persistent "Happy Days Are Here Again" echoed again through the armory. Radio listeners heard the mighty approval of the crowd with strains of the campaign song in the background, the listeners' impression of the speech was

72 Speaking out of a dynamic setting of applause and music, the NBC announcer said, "Ladies and Gentlemen: You have heard the President of the United States speaking before the fourth and final session of the New York State Democratic Convention. This was Mr. Roosevelt's first political address in his campaign for reelection to the presidency. He was introduced by Governor Herbert H. Lehman of the Empire State and the entire broadcast originated in the New York State Armory in Syracuse, New York. This program, sponsored by the Democratic National Committee, has come to you through the Red Network of the National Broadcasting Company." Text of this announcement was taken from the re-recording made by Audio-Scriptions, Incorporated, for the writer.
conditioned also by pictures of the speaker which appeared in the papers on October the first, a vivid portrayal of his gay camaraderie.

How did Roosevelt himself approach this speaking situation? This unprecedented move of appearing before a state convention and the sudden decision (but four days before presentation) to send the speech to the national audience are both facts which argue that the action had strategic value in the Roosevelt campaign.

Mark Sullivan would undoubtedly have supported this opinion, for he wrote, "At creating atmosphere, evoking such public moods as he wants, averting any public mood that would be detrimental to him—at all that Mr. Roosevelt is one of the most expert politicians in the modern world, a world in which the creation of desired moods in the public has become as never before a fundamental art in politics. Mr. Roosevelt is adept at that, and he is incredibly agile in all his tactics." New York Herald Tribune, September 29, 1936.
It is likely that confidence in his ability to conquer an issue through a public appearance was the reason for this speech, rather than nervousness over the charge of Communism. Although Roosevelt's "non-political"

75 One reporter who had raised the question of nervousness as a cause was Charles W. Hurd. New York Times, September 30, 1936.

campaign had been highly satisfactory from the free radio time it afforded him and especially from the noble air of seeking the public good which it allowed him to assume, yet his pleasure in direct campaigning, in addition to his supreme confidence in its effectiveness, may have made the speech occasion at the New York State Democratic Convention in Syracuse desirable to him. Despite this

76 "Non-aggressive policy, no matter how successful does not fit the born temperament of Franklin Roosevelt." Time, 28: 11, October 5, 1936, "Visitors."

change in strategy, he approached this address with the advantages which his "non-political" activities had brought him. The choice of this date and occasion for the

77 Albert L. Warner assessed this pre-campaign activity in this manner: "The President, in 'non-political' activities, speeches and tours, has carried on with deftness and alertness a campaign calculated to undermine his critics in their sources of criticism, to withstand their attacks of direct defense where necessary, to wrest from
them their own battle standards, and to carry on at the same time his personal appeal to the public. 'Coincidences,' 'emergencies,' and 'natural duties' of office have all contributed or have been invoked to aid the White House in as pretty a campaign from the point of view of political technicians as has been conducted in a long time." New York Herald Tribune, September 27, 1936.

Opening of the legitimate campaign may have been caused by the plan of Al Smith to address the nation on October 1, 1936. Since the issue of Communism was in the air and Al Smith's January speech had condemned the President strongly for his communistic relationships, Roosevelt may well have wished to anticipate a reiteration of the attacks. It is noteworthy that this speech was withheld from the papers until a short time before its delivery although it had been completed some hours before. The reason probably was that Roosevelt desired a ready-made occasion, such as

Franklyn Waltman suggested this possibility, adding that Roosevelt might figure that Smith would assert that recent happenings showed the truth of his former charges. Washington Post, October 1, 1936. By "recent developments" this reporter doubtless meant the Communist support of Roosevelt's candidacy. Waltman declared: "The reason for holding the speech secret apparently was to keep it from falling into the hands of the Republicans, who might broadcast a quick answer to it, or might in some other way anticipate its delivery. Thus the campaign is taking on the nature of a battle of the wits as well as oratory." Ibid., September 30, 1936.
the New York State Convention, as the background for the opening speech of his campaign.

It is likely that the President approached the situation not only purposefully but happily. With his sensitivity to incident as indicative of the general climate of opinion, he had been enjoying the past week a joke which portrayed him as the defender of the common man, a position deep in his philosophy. This happy aspect was demonstrated by the President when the Syracuse audience cheered him lengthily before he began his address. One reporter described him as quieting them by "affectionate, quieting gestures." Thus, an audience eager for the

---

80 Raymond Clapper reported the story which Roosevelt had been retelling merrily all week: "Republican candidate being driven through crowds in a certain city, heard shouts for Roosevelt. Showing some annoyance, a lady politician riding in his automobile sought to reassure him. "Don't pay any attention to them," she said, "they are only working people."" Watching the World, 1934-44, p. 88.


address and a candidate happy to speak to them comprised the elements of the speech situation in the Syracuse armory on September 29, 1936.
The President followed his formal salutation

"Governor Lehman, Mayor Thatcher, Ladies and Gentlemen." Mr. Lehman had been a well-liked New York Governor, recalled to candidacy by the urging of Roosevelt himself, a leader whose social policies had sometimes been termed the "Little New Deal." He had been renominated by the Syracuse Convention, but his popularity with the voters was decidedly less than Roosevelt's. Mayor Thatcher, an Albany delegate, was the permanent chairman of the convention.

with the gay, off-hand, impromptu remark: "From force of long habit, I had almost said, 'My fellow delegates.'"

Such recognition of the familiarity of the situation

He had been a delegate from Dutchess County to the State Convention held in Rochester in 1910, and had been there nominated for the twenty-sixth Senatorial District, Compton McKenzie, Mr. Roosevelt, E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1944, p. 58. He was renominated in the 1912 convention. Later conventions nominated him twice for governor, and he served from 1928 to 1932.

argued him a friend of New York and established a good basic orientation. This identification of audience and speaker was immediately reinforced by his terse statement of cooperation for the 1936 campaign. His deliberate

Charles Hurd reported that the opening impromptu remark was the first and last humorous remark, that thereafter he followed "closely" the text of his speech. New York Times, September 30, 1936.
stress on the words "join forces" was an implicit compliment to the Democratic organization; a radio listener favorable to Roosevelt would have felt the pleasurable sensation of being part of an effective association. The natural declaration at the opening

85 "There is much value in stressing the unanimity of feeling among the auditors." Oliver, op. cit., p. 173.

This sentence begins the prepared address. It is in connection with this Syracuse speech that Mr. Roosevelt himself explained his method of speech preparation. He wrote: "In the preparation of campaign speeches as well as speeches on other occasions I have called on many different people for advice and assistance....On various subjects I have received drafts and memoranda from different people, varying from short suggestions as to a sentence here and there, to long memoranda of factual material and, in some cases, complete addresses.

"In addition to such suggestions, I make it a practice to keep a 'speech material file'....Whenever anything catches my eye, either in the mail or in the press or in the course of reading articles, memoranda, or books, which I think will be of value in the preparation of a speech, I ask her to put it away in the speech material file...."

"In preparing a speech I usually take the various drafts and suggestions which have been submitted to me and also the material which has been accumulated in the speech file on various subjects, read them carefully, lay them aside, and then dictate my own draft....Naturally, the final speech will contain some of the thoughts and even drafts or suggestions submitted...."

"On some of my speeches I have prepared as many as five or six successive drafts myself after reading drafts and suggestions submitted by other people; and I have changed drafts from time to time after consulting with other people either personally or by telephone." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol. V, pp. 391-392.
of a political campaign Roosevelt immediately dignified by relating the campaign to higher issues.

The Democratic Party will carry the message of real Americanism

Roosevelt's declaration of "need for fidelity to the underlying conception of Americanism" implied an answer to Hoover, Borah, Senator Steiwer and Landon by insisting on getting behind the mere term. Simple partition of ideas was satisfying to the audience by

86 This partition was flattering to his audience in its implied invitation to rational thinking. Hollingworth pointed out that men desire to feel that their beliefs are based upon rational lines of thinking. "It is in part this inclination which leads the average man to welcome evidence, but to be satisfied with fallacious modes of proof. For this is enough to enable conviction, which springs from desire, to possess the appearance of cogent rational support." Op. cit., p. 158.

its promise to answer the challenges so ringingly made for a definition of this stand; 87 the attending character-

87 Hoover called his tactics evasive (Vital Speeches, 2: 572, June 15, 1936, "A Holy Crusade for Liberty"); Steiwer declared that the administration had not been "frank" (Ibid., p. 577, "Three Long Years"); Borah declared that the attitude of the party could only be learned by the public through understanding the candidates and platforms. (Ibid., p. 590, "Monopoly and the Campaign"). Lippmann was one of the many who tried to state the main issue: "whether the civilized peoples can maintain and
develop a free society or whether they are to fall back upon the ancient order of things when the whole of man's existence, their consciences, their science, their arts, their labor, and their integrity as individuals were at the disposition of the rulers of the state." Ibid., p. 603, July 1, 1936, "The Deepest Issue of Our Time."

- The pattern of the address is as follows:

I. The Democratic party will carry the message of real Americanism.

II. That the parties take a different stand on Communism is a false issue.
   
   A. Roosevelt's heritage and public record indicate adherence to American government.
   B. Roosevelt repudiates support of the Communists.

III. That the parties do different things about Communism is the real problem.
   
   A. Republican inaction allowed social unrest to grow.
   B. Democratic action by the Federal government caused the crisis to be passed without disaster.
   C. Democratic leadership in New York has met changing social needs.
      1. Democratic leadership began its progressive policies in 1911.
      2. Smith and Roosevelt as governors furthered progressive advance.
      3. Governor Lehman has continued the progressive tradition.
IV. America can depend on the Democratic party to preserve democracy through true conservatism.

A. Great strides toward such preservation have been made in the last three years.
B. Roosevelt pledges liberal conservatism.

That the parties take a different stand on Communism is a false issue

The President's argument on the separation of issues into false and true ones opened with a vigorous aggressive assertion of the presence of false issues.

Roosevelt's prepared address had used these words: "There will be--there are..." (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol. V, p. 383), but in the oral presentation he declared, "I need not tell you that there will be--there are..." This change replaced a weak affirmative phrasing with the power of innuendo gained by denial of the negative; this increase of power in the first element of the contrast allowed the second element to add the force of alternation to its shift of time, an addition which brought a degree of surprise. Such an effective impromptu alteration of words and meaning exemplifies his "inspired last minute interpolations," of which Heywood Broun wrote. Washington News, October 22, 1936.

By disdainful tone, by characterization of such tactics as weakness and unwillingness to face realities, he set the framework for listing the "red herrings" which had been
dragged out against the fathers of our country. This Each of these charges can be verified from historical sources. The accusation that Washington planned to make himself king probably arose from the suggestion by Colonel Lewis Nichola, possibly at the instigation of other Colonial officers, a suggestion which Washington spurned immediately and explicitly. (David M. Matteson, Washington the Colonial and National Statesman, U.S. George Washington Bicentennial Commission, Washington, D.C., p. 65.)

The French Revolutionary plans attributed to Jefferson were likely the result of Jefferson's very real love for France; he as an individual welcomed Spain's move in ceding Louisiana to France for it gave him the opportunity "to clear his character from the aspersions of those Federalists who had so bitterly accused him of loving France better than his native land." (John T. Norse, Jr., Thomas Jefferson, Houghton, Mifflin & Company, Boston, 1899, p. 210.)

Andrew Jackson's currency and bank controversies were factors in the ranging of the wealth of the country against him; the pro-Adams press charged that he had conspired with Burr to commit treason against the United States. (Gerald W. Johnson, Andrew Jackson, Milton, Balch & Company, New York, 1927, pp. 227-229)

The charge of dictatorship against Lincoln was pointed out by Carl Sandburg: "With no cessation came assorted varieties of the assertion that "we are all the cowering, shivering subjects of the bloody Emperor Abraham..."" (The War Years, Harcourt, Brace & Company, New York, 1939, Vol. III, p. 391)

The "Destroyer" charge on Theodore Roosevelt may have been made on him many times during his years of attacks on trusts and big business, but one such charge was made in 1912 when he became the candidate of the Progressive Party. "Many conservative papers including the New York Times... and New York Sun (Ind.), Tribune (Rep.), and Herald (Ind.), and Baltimore American (Rep.) consider, to use the Sun's phrase, that 'the sum tendency and purpose of his proposals is nothing less
than the destruction of the American polity, as it is under the constitution, and the creation of a monstrous socialist, despotic state..." (Literary Digest, 45: 246, August 17, 1912).

Woodrow Wilson was often called the "messiah" as in the heading of Chapter VIII in Bailey's study of the war leader (Thomas A. Bailey, Woodrow Wilson and the Lost Peace, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1944. p. 106); Wilson's assumption of the role was declared by his great English contemporary, "I really think that at first the idealistic President regarded himself as a missionary whose function it was to rescue the poor European heathen from their age-long worship of false and fiery gods." (David L. George, Memoirs of the Peace Conference, Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, 1939, vol. I, p. 141.

alignment of the attacks upon himself with those upon the fathers of democracy was strong ethical proof. Roosevelt's vibrant voice showed by sharply descending inflection the absurdity of the charges; this emphasis of the analogy by voice was particularly strong on the phrase, "soaked the rich." 91

91 The biting scorn expressed here through prolongation of the first word and an extreme and sudden drop of pitch to the other two words pointed out this charge as having been made against himself as well. The Literary Digest reporter said that "shaking his head, thrusting out his jaw, gesturing with outstretched hand, he lambasted those...who would make Communism an issue in this election." 122: 6, October 10, 1936.

Having thus characterized such attacks, Roosevelt declared Communism to be the "red herring" in
this campaign. The charge had been brought by McCormick and Hearst in their papers, and by the National Jeffersonian Democrats in their campaign. Roosevelt's statement that the issue of Communism was not drawn between the parties was valid; neither political platform had mentioned the issue as such. Nevertheless, the fact that the Communists had declared their preference for Roosevelt had implicitly characterized his policies as favorable to their goals. This fact, coupled with the

As Mark Sullivan pointed out, "When the Communist leaders say they want Mr. Roosevelt reelected, we must assume they know what is best for their purpose." Washington Star, September 22, 1936.

strength of the attacks by his opponents, had made it necessary for Roosevelt to answer this issue; time and place were favorable at Syracuse on September 29 because of the vigorous discussion of the Communistic leanings of two Democratic electors in New York State.

92 He ridiculed the charge by his tone of condescending toleration; he invited an amused attitude toward it, as in the masterful use of pause before and inflection in the final element, "it's Russian." Getting the audience to laugh together, as Roosevelt had done by his words and use of voice, unified the members of the audience against the object of the amusement. Characterization of the groups making this charge gained force through strong parallel arrangement.

93 As Mark Sullivan pointed out, "When the Communist leaders say they want Mr. Roosevelt reelected, we must assume they know what is best for their purpose." Washington Star, September 22, 1936.
Roosevelt offered his heritage and his record of public service as proofs that he adhered to the American form of government. His claim that the record of the past twenty-five years in State and Federal Government had shown "simple, clear and consistent adherence not only to the letter but to the spirit of the American form of government" was true if the premises underlying thinking.

Although Roosevelt had not developed these premises very fully when he first campaigned through Dutchess County for the State Senatorship in 1910 (as Mrs. Roosevelt pointed out, This is My Story, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1937, p. 173), he campaigned against bossism; he won reelection to the Senate on an elaborate program of farm relief and worked on a committee to investigate vice in New York City. Roosevelt's contacts with Woodrow Wilson, beginning with a visit to the New Jersey Governor in 1911, served to develop new standards of judgment, particularly in regard to the common man and his importance in the nation. "Before Roosevelt had been in Washington a year (in Wilson's cabinet) he had begun to show his capacity to grow and flourish under the infection of these ideas." (Frances Perkins, The Roosevelt I Knew, p. 17) John T. Flynn questioned whether Roosevelt had given much thought to individual freedom and private enterprise before 1913. (Country Squire in the White House, Doubleday Doran & Company, New York, 1940, p. 13) By the time he had become Governor of New York
(1928), he had grown to feel that the two problems of modern civilization—restoration of democratic processes and the development of social justice—must be accomplished by "strong, vital government action." (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol. 1, pp. xi-xiii) And that government would be able to perform such action he believed that it should follow a policy of experimentation. In his address at Oglethorpe University on May 22, 1932, he said: "Do not confuse objectives with methods. When the Nation becomes substantially in favor of planning the broad objectives of civilization, then true leadership must unite thought behind definite methods.

The country needs and, unless I mistake its temper, the country demands bold, persistent experimentation. It is common sense to take a method and try it. If it fails, admit it frankly and try another. But above all, try something." (Ibid., p. 646)

were granted but strong disagreement with these premises led his opponents to deny his claim of consistency. This personal direction of the government seemed a major question. Governor Landon's charge, made in his

96 Walter Lippmann wrote: "The issue has not been over policies but over personal power and the process by which policy shall be determined. And in so far as a determination has been aroused to reduce the personal power of the President and to revive the processes of consultation and deliberation, the American people will have won all there is to be won out of this election." New York Herald Tribune, October 31, 1936.

acceptance address at Topeka, Kansas, on July 23, 1936.

97 The record shows that these measures did not fit together into any definite program of recovery. Many of them worked at cross-purposes and defeated themselves...

was indicative to the accusations so repeatedly made, charges which undoubtedly seemed irrelevant to Roosevelt, and significant of a naive attitude toward government.98

98 Roosevelt had written: "Nothing is more striking than the simple innocence of the men who insist whenever an objective is present, on the prompt production of a patent scheme guaranteed to produce a result." Looking Forward, The John Day Company, New York, 1933. p. 8.

Declaring his conformation to that record, Roosevelt denied having sought and directly repudiated the support of any "advocate of Communism" or other alien "ism". The force and manner in which the President threw out the word "repudiate" showed the power of his rejection.99 Even his strong repetition of phrase,

99 The editorial writer for the Catholic World declared that "The words were vigorous, and they were delivered with great oratorical emphasis. The President's facial expression when he spoke them gave evidence—unless he is a very clever actor—of sincerity and depth of conviction." 144: 129, November, 1936.

"That is my position. It always has been my position. And it always will be my position," however, would not
answer the objections of those who wanted to hear the President explain his stand on Dubinsky as an elector on the New York State ballot, and on the American Labor Party, which included three groups headed by recognized Communist leaders. For those who accepted the President's basic premises, this declaration would have acceptably, even powerfully, answered the "red herring."

Republican inaction allowed social unrest to grow.

Exactness in summarizing the contention which has been considered and in so stating the one to be taken up as to show its logical relationships is valuable in the structure of a speech. Roosevelt was effective in his turn from the thoughts of the parties about Communism to the actions of the parties in regard to the basic conditions underlying Communism. Roosevelt opened his attack upon Republican inaction which brought the crisis of 1933 with a brief assertion of the Democratic success in handling the causes of unrest, offering the present recovery as proof. He charged the crisis to have been

100 Farmers, laborers and other benefitted groups would not have been disposed to recall that the Brookings Institution had concluded that the "NRA on the whole retarded recovery" or that the League of Nations' figures showed the United States as but thirteenth in the percentage of recovery. Even business men might have felt as Mr. Filene: "No clear-thinking business man would
discharge an executive under whom the business had climbed from failure to success, and hire some unknown who promised to reduce total expenditures without reducing any one expenditure." New York Herald Tribune, August 22, 1936. Nevertheless, the statement probably was received as having a higher measure of validity than it deserved, at least among the audience at Syracuse.

the result of twelve years of "neglect of the causes of economic and social unrest." Adequate consideration was not given by Roosevelt at this point, or elsewhere in the campaign, to the possibility that the crisis had been a part of a world-wide catastrophe.

The President amplified the idea of crisis by bringing it out in three clear ways—referring to its causes, then its possibilities, and finally its specific ramifications. Implicit in his statement that such

101 Genung pointed out that one of the principal objects of amplification is "To give an idea its proper coloring or atmosphere; that is, to express it in a style adapting it to act, according to its intrinsic power, upon the sensibilities, or the understanding, or the will. Some thoughts that reasoned out would have comparatively little effect might appeal strongly to the imagination. Some need merely the white light of clear presentation. Others still are full of latent eloquence and power on motive. It is on the appropriate amplification that we must depend, to make each thought do its predestined work in the reader's mind." Op. cit. p. 463.

a crisis was made "to order for all those who would overthrow our form of government" was refutation of the
charges of his opponents in the present campaign that he was seeking to change the American form of government and that the country was in danger in his hands. He

An editorial writer pointed out that "The issue is not what Mr. Roosevelt thinks his position to be. The issue is the position in which he will leave the country when the period of custodianship allotted to him as a solemn trust is at an end." Washington Post, October 1, 1936. This was the criticism which the President had doubtless wished to avoid.

argued with validity and force that since the country had arisen from a crisis in which a turn from democratic government would have been easy, such a danger was less likely in these admittedly better times.

The third form of amplification of the idea of crisis is a series of five questions opening with the words "Do I need to recall..." Again the power of an emotionally characterized framework is used, for Roosevelt calls these specific pictures of depression days "fears" a term which indirectly suggests the presumed author of their disappearance. This whole passage of vividly-evoked scenes is powerful both in the sense of desperate movement which it evokes and from the very number of strong basic human drives it touches--self-preservation, love of family, love of home--and touches these in terms
of basic relationships to food and shelter. Throughout

103 The examples referred to here are of three kinds: secret activities, planned activities, overt activities. Those of the third type can be supported by data from the period. Basil Rauch said of the "homeless boys": "Tens of thousands had left dispiriting homes and had taken to roaming as tramps. Many turned to crime as a means of livelihood." (Op. cit., pp. 168-169) An illustration of the desperate measures sometimes taken by the farmers is this: "Henry L. Dillingham, U.S. Marshall, was set upon by snarling, enraged Missouri farmers bent on stopping a farm-foreclosure sale....sale of the 320 acre farm belonging to Sam B. Divelbiss was not held." (Literary Digest, 120: 7, August 24, 1935) Many similar occurrences were reported in 1932.

104 Frederick L. Allen wrote: "First there were bankers by the thousands, thronging the corridors of the Treasury, buttonholing their Senators to explain just why their banks should be permitted to reopen, and converging upon an emergency office set up in the Washington Building by the Acting Comptroller of the Currency...." Since Yesterday, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1939-40, p. 111, "Congress had adjourned, but now the business men were there by the bewildered thousands to draw up NRA codes." Ibid., p. 126.
This inclusion of the bankers and industrialists among those who had feared in time of crisis must have been a point of consideration for the New Yorkers who were his immediate audience. Here was lacking the condemnation with which Roosevelt and the Democratic party had been assailing them; here they were included among those who had seen difficult times in the depression and had been pleading for help.

The positive side of the picture was then presented. Roosevelt was right that "most people" would remember that "starvation was averted" by the Civilian Conservation Corps, which took 250,000 young men to the forests, by the Federal Relief Administration, which made grants to the states for direct relief, and the Public Works Administration, which provided employment by the construction of public buildings, parks and many another project; that "homes and farms were saved" by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1936, which refinanced farm mortgages at low interest rates, that "banks were reopened" within two weeks after March 4, 1936; that "crop prices rose" from an index of 55 to 83 from March to July, 1933; that "industry revived"
with the index of production rising from 56 in March to 101 in July, 1933.

Having undoubtedly built a feeling of gratitude for these gains, Roosevelt turned with an analogy to portray vividly the ingratitude of big business. Roosevelt liked this touch but, in truth, it over-

Raymond Clapper commented on Roosevelt's effectiveness "When he dispenses with tiresome facts and swings out gaily with satirical references to angry old gentlemen who have lost their silk hats." Watching the World, 1934-1944, p. 88.

simplified a situation which involved far more than

Robert T. Oliver pointed out that the persuasive speaker should take care not to oversimplify, that "A social problem which is crystal clear and can be phrased neatly is all too likely to be no more than a half-truth." (Op. cit., p. 155) Ewbank and Auer have listed the tendency to accept "specious argument" as one of the aspects of group thinking. (Op. cit., p. 225).
ingratitude for unmixed favors.\textsuperscript{109} It must be recalled

\textsuperscript{109}This oversimplification of the occurrence was pointed out in editorial comment that declared the rescue to have been accomplished partly by efforts of the "old gentleman" himself, that pointed out that the rescuer overwhelmed him with unwanted precautions which robbed him of his liberty of action and continually reminded him that "he once fell off a pier." \textit{Washington Star}, September 30, 1936.

that the New Deal turned from attempts at cooperation with business men during its first years to an antibusINESS program in 1935. Calm assessment of this "nice old gentleman wearing a silk hat" analogy discloses its somewhat fallacious reasoning but reveals also its immediate effectiveness before an audience which had been conditioned to condemn ingratitude as a base, ignoble reaction.

Democratic action passed the crisis without disaster.

Roosevelt's use of "explicit reference\textsuperscript{110} in the

\textsuperscript{110}Genung explains the use of demonstrative words or phrases to "express some resumption or immediate sequence,—to make a close joinery of some new thought with the preceding." \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 371.

words "that crisis" returned the hearers directly to the point in the argument from which he had departed to
vivify the crisis to his auditors. The use of question and answer form concentrated attention upon the "record" as the answer to the "crisis." His quotation of the

111 "This "unfigurative" asking of questions "is a means of taking the reader into partnership with the writer, as it were, in conducting an investigation." Ibid., p. 97. The value would be equally strong in speech.

statement regarding the Democratic offering of a "workable program of reconstruction" from his acceptance address of July 2, 1932, was implicit rebuttal of the


broken-promise charge thrown at him so frequently, as in Al Smith's January speech.113 That both recovery and

113 Vital Speeches, 2: 282-6, February 10, 1936, "Peripatetics."

reform measures had been adopted to get at the causes

114 Typical recovery acts were the AAA and the NIRA. Three significant reform measures were the TVA, the Securities Act and the Glass-Steagall Banking Act. "Each of the three laws had been promised in the Democratic platform, and was a specific application of the reform traditions which had been interrupted when Woodrow Wilson left the White House." Basil Rauch, op. cit., p. 80.

was true. In the years of 1935 and 1936 Roosevelt had
struck at the economic maladjustment, but that his measures had been taken "within" the American "Institutions" had been strongly denied by the invalidations by the Supreme Court of acts which lay at the heart of his program, such as the AAA and the NRA.

Roosevelt rounded out his comparison of Democratic and Republican leadership by vivid characterization of the Republican evasion of the "conditions congenial to Communism." His claim of Republican bewilderment was largely true. 115 The Republicans did

115 "From the first the administration adopted a policy of minimizing the extent of the depression....All that was necessary for a return of prosperity was a restoration of confidence. To this end the administration directed its energies. In conference after conference with the industrial leaders of the country, President Hoover urged the maintenance of employment and wages; in speech after speech he exhorted the nation to keep a stiff upper lip." Morison and Commager, op. cit., p. 546.

not consider themselves inactive, 116 but their policies

116 "Realizing, however, the necessity of temporary government aid, the President recommended a modest program of public works. At the same time the Federal Farm Board extended aid to depressed farmers and Congress voted relief to those who had been made destitute by the great drought of 1930. Yet these half-hearted measures were largely nullified by other administrative policies, notably the Hawley-Smoot tariff and the refusal to recognize or permit trade relations with Soviet Russia." Ibid.
were ineffectual in meeting the needs. Hoover's consistent adherence to the "trickle-down" theory validated Roosevelt's charge of a short-sighted policy.\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{117}"Mounting figures of unemployment proved the theory fallacious and indicated the necessity for a more realistic view of the whole economic problem." \textit{Ibid.}, p. 548.

Roosevelt advanced the argument that Hoover's request for a declaration of policy before Roosevelt's inauguration was proof of Republican lack of preparation, an interpretation with a measure of truth. On the other hand, such an explanation was over-simplified in its neglect of factors, such as the new president's natural desire to keep his administration untangled with the policies of the unsuccessful leadership.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{118}This indictment is enforced through short, parallel sentences giving the sense of rapid blows on a punching bag: "Lacking courage, they evaded. Being selfish, they neglected. Being short-sighted, they ignored." Effective use of contrast through the time element, stressed both by phraseology and by voice, sets the staccato words, "we should do, overnight," against the prolonged phrase, "what they should have been doing through the years."

emphasis upon the idea that the conditions neglected by the Republicans are the seedbed of Communism shifted, rather effectively for those who accepted the President's
use of governmental power without fear, the danger of its appearance in America to Republican administration.

Roosevelt's analysis of the causes of this unpreparedness into two factors—weakness in leadership and inability to see the causes of economic trouble—was sound. He enforced this assertion that detachment from reality is a primary reason for failure of government by a quotation which generalized his idea. Roosevelt's

119 The Reference Department of the Library of Congress in a letter of April 9, 1948, to the writer declared its inability to identify this excellently phrased quotation. It is the suggestion of this writer that the words paraphrase a passage from Lord Macaulay's speech on Parliamentary Reform, made to the House of Commons on December 16, 1831. Since Roosevelt quoted directly from Lord Macaulay later in this address and since the sense of his speech agrees closely with that expressed repeatedly by the great Englishman, the suggestion of a paraphrase seems tenable. Perhaps the following passage was recast: "It is because rulers do not pay sufficient attention to the stages of this great movement [the great march of society], because they underrate its force, because they are ignorant of its law, that so many violent and fearful revolutions have changed the face of society." Lord Thomas B. Macaulay, Speeches and Poems, Houghton, Mifflin and Co., Boston, 1874, p. 107.

Specific conclusion, suggesting the possibilities attendant on this detachment as the reason why "our American form of government will continue to be safest in Democratic hands," may well have been direct refutation
of Landon's similar declaration in his Minneapolis address five days before. 120

---

120 Landon had said, "It seems to me that the farmer would do better to trust the Republican party." New York Times, September 25, 1936.

---

Roosevelt was correct in saying that Communism grows easily in socially disturbed groups; he was correct in stating that American groups had been economically and socially disturbed during the Republican administrations; he was correct when he said that during his administration these conditions had been strikingly alleviated. His conclusion that, therefore, the country should trust further to Democratic administration could not be validly drawn without serious consideration of the causal factors of these events and also of possible attendant evils in their alleviation; he did not attempt this analysis. One further step which he had to and did take was the identification of the present Republican leadership with that which he has been indicting; however, his assertion neglected proof in the face of factors showing at least the possibility of change in the Republican party's direction 121 and thus left a weak link at
Among the factors which showed strong possibility of change in Republican leadership were these:

(1) Senator Borah had set out to smash the Old Guard control of the Republican party a year before this time, attacking particularly Charles D. Nilles of New York.

(2) Governor Landon declined private conferences with Joseph K. Grundy of Pennsylvania and with Charles D. Nilles of New York—Old Guard powers—on his way to a speaking engagement in Buffalo; Landon defied the Hearst powers by denouncing teachers' oaths. *News-Week*, 8: 11, September 5, 1936.

(3) Governor Landon's telegram to the Republican Convention declared his insurgency; William A. White pointed out that the liberal Republican platform was Landon's victory. *New York Times*, June 12, 1936.

(4) Candidate Landon gathered about him an advisory group of Kansans which might show Americans the "homespun troupe" upon whom he would rely. *Ibid.*, August 23, 1936, Arthur Krock.


(6) Reliable analysts accepted the "new leadership" as actual; for example, Raymond Clapper (*Watching the World, 1934-44*, p. 144) and Anne O'Hare McCormick. The latter declared: "The prairies are in revolt against the Old Guard and the Old Guard caved in before the assault because they had reconciled themselves to defeat.... The grass-roots delegates represent the American Main Street and the return of the GOP to its original address and its early habits....To the observer fresh from Europe it had the feel of a ground swell...."*New York Times*, June 14, 1936.

a vital point. The President drew an untenable conclusion from this unproved premise, for he argued that the present
leadership, being in truth the former leadership, would never "comprehend the need for a program of social justice," thus by-passing the undeniable fact that many prominent Republicans had supported the emergency action of 1933 without partisan regard. Certainly Roosevelt's strong assertion, which brought a burst of applause, was more fitted for the appreciation of his immediate audience and adherents elsewhere than for logical analysis.


Democratic administration in New York has met changing social needs.

Roosevelt emphasized Democratic achievement in New York as further evidence of Democratic action versus Republican inaction. 123 He characterized the Republican leaders, in the face of "a situation made to order for potential unrest," with the classic example of governmental
indifference and apathy, "Let them eat cake," uttering the words with biting scorn.

His examination of the Democratic versus Republican administrations in New York State allowed him four effective steps: (1) commendation of two New Yorkers, "Bob Wagner" and Al Smith; (2) reference to the social legislation which they secured; (3) classification of Al Smith, himself and Governor Lehman as carrying forward the tradition of "practical intelligence;" (4) clarification of the governor's task.

Roosevelt pointed out that he came into public office in the State in 1911 as the new philosophy of government came in and that he found Wagner and Smith there holding the same progressive beliefs. It is to be noted that Roosevelt's familiar reference to Wagner linked him with the only person who had been applauded with any spirit by the delegates; the reference to Al Smith, with its complete absence of allusion to present variance, showed him a statesman above petty bickering.

124 Since Al Smith's speech before the American Liberty League on January 25, 1936, the relationship between Smith and Roosevelt had been of great interest, particularly to citizens of the State of New York. This identification of philosophies made Smith seem the "Jacob's Voice" which Joe Robinson had called him in his answer to the Liberty League Speech three nights later. (Vital Speeches, 2: 287-290, February 10, 1936.) It was
this identification of philosophies which brought a reinterpretation from Smith at Carnegie Hall, New York City, on October 1, 1936. Declaring that the President had been right, he cited his own activity on the Factory laws, workmen's compensation acts and Child Welfare problems and declared: "And I stand today just exactly where I stood then." He claimed that the New Deal performance was different in two respects, for the New York laws were framed within the constitution and were prepared by executive and legislative leaders in conference to arrange a bill to carry out platform promises. (Vital Speeches, 3: 16-19, October 15, 1936, "I Am an American Before I Am a Democrat.") But this identification was in line with Roosevelt's belief in unifying factions and no doubt was an effective bit of ethical proof.

The President's listing of the legislation which the new Democratic leadership secured not only refreshed in the minds of the New Yorkers the good which had been accomplished while he was serving the state but also obtained direct verbal answer from his audience that such legislation called "radical and alien to our form of government" at the time, would not be so designated in 1936. These cries of "No!" were effective response to an argument which was important in its clear, though unspoken, analogy with the President's present relationship to national legislation.

When he linked Smith, himself and Lehman as partners in the traditional fight of Democratic forces in the State against a hindering Republican opposition,
On 284 major bills endorsed by the Federation of American Federation of Labor and introduced into both houses between 1921 and 1935, 87.6% of those legislators who recorded no adverse votes were Democrats, while only 11.8% were Republicans. Belle Zeller, Pressure Politics in New York, Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, New York, 1937, pp. 24-25.

he was doing more than praising the delegates, more than seeking acclaim for the record and votes for Lehman and himself therefrom; he was implicitly enforcing the idea that Republican leadership is unchanging.  

No doubt the New Yorkers present in Syracuse and listening by radio over the state were reminded of the recent defeat by the Republican assembly of Governor Lehman's nine point Social Security Program. The delegates had planned to mention this defeat strongly in their campaign throughout the state for Democratic votes. New York Herald Tribune, September 28, 1936, Lamoyne A. Jones.

And, finally, Roosevelt identified Lehman's task in New York State and his in the Nation as being that of maintaining "contact between statecraft and reality," an analogy which dignified Lehman's duty in his State and secured the New Yorkers' realizations of their own needs for his program on the national scene. The conclusion that this type of government had really brought  

Roosevelt had condemned the government of the past several decades for "withdrawing from practical
contact with citizens as human individuals." Government-
not politics, Stratford Press, "New York, 1932, p. 27.

"protection and preservation of our institutions" was
repetition of the idea that changes made under his hand
had been within the constitutional reforms. 128

128Roosevelt's emphasis upon this matter was an
attempt to settle the listeners' vague fears that there
might be some truth in the charges of his opponents that
his methods were dangerous to the Constitution. Holling-
worth pointed out that "Repetition with variation promotes

This passage concerning New York State legis-
lation was valuable before the New York audience in its
concern with immediate problems; moreover, no listener
could have missed the analogy with national politics.
Roosevelt had been able indirectly to urge various
opinions which he wished the electorate to accept; that
his present political conduct was in line with that which
had brought benefits in State government; that his
political views were far-sighted and would not be called
radical in later years; that Republican leadership was
unchanging, short-sighted and out of touch with reality;
that social reforms could take place within the revered
constitutional forms.

The President introduced "comic relief" by a
hypothetical paragraph from his Republican adversary, whose name he did not mention but whose speech manner he simulated;\(^{129}\) no doubt he referred to Landon's speech

\(^{129}\)News reporters did not fail to see this representation: Frederick W. Wile pointed out "Unintentionally or otherwise, he caused some of his listeners to think he was mockingly simulating Governor Landon's radio style." (Washington Star, October 2, 1936) Another declared: "Not once did Nominee Roosevelt mention his Republican opponent by name. But no listener mistook the object of his mimicry when, toward the end of his speech, he dropped into a mocking singsong which set his audience howling with delight, declared: 'Let me warn you and let me warn the nation..." (Time, 28: 13, October 12, 1936) The swift turn in speech style, in addition to the mocking voice must be noted. Roosevelt used short, simply made, childish sentences with the childish expression, "Cross our hearts and hope to die." Roosevelt's amusement at the futility of the Republican campaign burst forth here in this belittling of his opponent and his opponent's argument.

at Milwaukee on September 26, three nights before,\(^{130}\) and

\(^{130}\)Landon had said: "I am a profound believer in the justice and necessity of old age pensions" but had suggested a security act without the $47,000,000 reserve fund and declared his belief that this plan would, therefore, be "much less expensive." New York Times, September 27, 1936.

at Des Moines, Iowa, on September 22, 1936.\(^{131}\) This was

\(^{131}\)At that time Landon had explained his position: "I am equally emphatic in my views on meeting the suffering caused by the present drought. We will use the full power of government to relieve the present distress.... Where such help is needed, we will give it promptly. There will be no waste and no politics.
"Let me repeat this part of the Republican program. We will not allow needless suffering in this country—either on our farms or in our cities. We are determined to extend every reasonable aid to our people to get them back on a self-supporting basis in the shortest possible time. The Republican party proposes to put an end to the present waste and extravagance. It is our pledge to extend within the limits of sound finance, adequate credit at reasonable rates, to capable tenants and experienced farmers, for the purchase or re-financing of farm homes." Ibid., September 23, 1936.

the same attack on Landon's campaigning as Governor Martin of Oregon had made in the Democratic broadside made by the six governors in late July. This disparaging

132 Martin had said, "As far as I can make out, the platform of the Republican nominee is offering the country a New Deal of his own in diluted form." New York Times, July 29, 1936.

treatment of his opponent served as a basis for the conclusion of his argument that the country could not depend upon Republican leadership. He set aside Landon's claim of achieving the goals by more efficient means with the analysis that Republican leadership was really "against the job's being done." He supported this analysis with two arguments: One, that past promises had not been carried out by Republican administrations, was a vague idea supported only by reference to the small amount of social legislation adopted either in New York State or in Washington, D.C., by the Republicans. Proof
that these Republican administrations had ever made such a promise was lacking; the other, that Republican inconsistency in the stand taken in the East and the West, argued the impossibility of keeping both promises, was valid on the taxation issue which he cited. Thus,

---

133 Landon had recommended the immediate repeal of the Surplus Tax Bill in Buffalo, New York, on August 26, (Vital Speeches, 2: 762-5, September 15, 1936, "Federal and Family Finances"), and had committed himself in Des Moines a week later to carrying out "all the outstanding obligations made by the present administration with the American farmer." New York Times, September 23, 1936.

he indicted Republican leadership strongly for its weak record of achievement and for its basic opposition to accomplishment of purposes it now claimed to serve.

The Democratic party will preserve democracy through liberal conservatism.

Roosevelt's interpretation of the preservation of democracy as making the internal changes necessary to correct its abuses rather than refusing "to face the need for change," served as a powerful summary to his contrast between Republican and Democratic leadership; it was valid and it allowed

---

134 Morison and Commager declared: "However the historian may wish to strike the balance between credits and debits, three things are clear: the new deal, in one
form or another, was inevitable; it was directed toward preserving capitalistic economy rather than substituting another system; and the methods employed were in the American tradition." Op. cit., p. 592.

Roosevelt to elevate the tenor of his discourse in the conclusion. His dynamic claim, "Never has a Nation made greater strides in the safeguarding of democracy than we have made during the past three years," based upon his argument that the causes of unrest had been eliminated, was also true if the attendant evil of undue governmental assumption of power were not allowed.

Roosevelt dignified his principle—that conservatism must be adjusted in changing times—by declaring it as "long known" by "wise and prudent men," and by restating it in the words of "the great essayist, Lord Macaulay. Roosevelt's closing sentence

135 Lord Macaulay used this sentence, "Turn where we may, within, around, the voice of great events is proclaiming to us, Reform, that you may preserve," in the peroration of his Speech on Parliamentary Reform in the House of Commons on March 2, 1831. Op. cit., p. 38. It is to be noted that the published form of Roosevelt's speech retained the correct word "preserve" in this quotation, but the recording shows that Roosevelt said "conserve" when he presented the address. Of course, this distinction is inconsequential, since the two are synonyms, but the change does make the quotation more vividly persuasive in an argument in which attention is centered on the word "conserve." It is probable that the President decided to sacrifice accuracy of quotation for the additional force which the more apt word would give.
Roosevelt identified himself with this great tradition of reform by declaring, "I am that kind of a conservative because I am that kind of a liberal," thus completing his refutation of the Communist charge by firm statement of his true position.

136 That this repudiation of Communism had taken up a major share of the address was interpreted differently by news analysts: The Time editorial writer interpreted the move as showing that Roosevelt and his advisers were "genuinely alarmed" (Time, 28:13, October 12, 1936); Mark Sullivan pointed out that the President's attention given to the matter would cause the public to remember the charge (New York Herald Tribune, October 1, 1936); Frederic W. Wile assessed the sound of his repudiation as heard over the radio to indicate that he was "both angry and anxious" (Washington Star, October 2, 1936); Franklyn Waltman concluded that the President "did an unusually good job in comforting his party workers on the Communist issue..." Washington Post, October 1, 1936.

137 Roosevelt's addition of the article "a" in the phrase "kind of liberal" and "kind of conservative" was an impromptu choice, for the printed version shows the grammatical form. This adoption of the colloquial form has the advantage, however, of providing an upbeat preparatory to the accent given the contrasted words following each usage.

Summary and Interpretation

Roosevelt opened his Presidential campaign of 1936, on September 29, with a speech in true fighting spirit at the Democratic State Convention in Syracuse, New York. He spoke to the thousands of delegates and
Syracusans with such vigor and point that the New York party workers went enthusiastically to their campaign duties.

Roosevelt selected as his theme for this address the question of Communistic leanings in the New Deal government. Although the agricultural problem had demanded much of the President's time since his address in Philadelphia three months before, several considerations made it unsuited for the opening gun of the campaign. He felt that Landon's argument on the farm issue in Des Moines, Iowa, on September 22, should be answered at some point in the Midwest. Furthermore, the stand of the two parties on this issue was too similar to afford Roosevelt a sufficiently powerful contention to uphold in his opening speech. Nor would the problem of foreign relations allow him a contention suitable for a group organized to achieve a domestic political victory.

But the Communism issue seemed eminently suited for the occasion. Repeated charges that Roosevelt had Communistic leanings and was to receive Communist support had been made. Al Smith's speech before the Liberty League in January had been one of the most
caustic condemnations of Roosevelt on this issue. Hearst and McCormick had pressed the charge in their papers and Roosevelt had flung back a newspaper answer. Now the presence of Dubinsky, an alleged Communist, on the list of Democratic electors of New York was causing violent discussion. Roosevelt needed to answer, before a favorable group, the charge of having Communist sympathies. He needed to deny the charge by a vigorous address in New York State, home ground to Smith and himself. This denial he needed to achieve without alienating Dubinsky, who was a powerful labor leader in New York City. Thus, Roosevelt came to Syracuse, New York, to repudiate the charge of Communism.

Ideas and Logical Proofs

Roosevelt proclaimed the need for Democrats to be faithful to the "underlying conception of Americanism," analyzing the task into two problems: the separation of the false from the real issues, and the clarification of the real issues. His conclusion from this task was that American government would be safest in Democratic hands.

The false issue was that Communism was a controversy between the two major parties, that the
charge against him of Communism leaning had validity. He ranged himself, as the Republicans attacked him on this false issue, with the founders of our country who had been similarly set upon, and pointed to his heritage and to his years of service to State and nation as proof of his constant adherence to American government. This proof was strong for those who accepted his premises of governmental function—that government should be empowered to do for the people what they need done, and should shift from program to program in striving for these general goals—for they would look at achievements without questioning the use of power. On the other hand, this proof had little weight for those whose concept of government demanded a candidate who enunciated in the campaign and carried out, when in office, a specific program.

The second problem involved consideration of Republican and Democratic action relative to Communism. Two premises underlay the argument which Roosevelt presented here: one, that conditions of social unrest provided the most favorable ground for the growth of Communism; the other, that the Republican leadership of 1936 was the same old leadership and would again allow the conditions conducive to Communism to develop. The
first premise was a valid basis for argument as far as it went. From it Roosevelt argued that the Republican inaction on these conditions of unrest resulting from economic maladjustment brought the threat of Communism, whereas Democratic alleviation of the conditions, in both New York State and the nation, had eliminated the threat. This argument was weak insofar as it failed to consider that unemployment, perhaps the condition most conducive to the unrest upon which Communism thrived, was the problem least effectively dealt with by the New Deal. Another weakness lay in its failure to meet the problem of the tendency toward undue concentration of power in the executive branch of the Federal government which had accompanied this alleviation.

Roosevelt's second premise—that the 1936 Republican leadership was the same leadership as before—was only partly true. Upon this premise, which he felt was verified by Landon's inconsistent promises of saving and spending at the same time, Roosevelt build the conclusion that the country would be safer in Democratic hands. This argument was weakened by its failure to consider that the Republican party had been pushed far from its earlier conservatism by participation in the New Deal activities and also by internal party
reconstruction. Subordinate in the development of Roosevelt's whole argument was the reiterated assertion that New Deal remedies for these conditions had been brought "within" the American institutions. On the surface, this claim does not seem borne out by the Supreme Court's invalidation of Roosevelt's key recovery measures, the NRA and the AAA; probably Roosevelt was here interpreting this interplay between Court and legislature as one of the examples of democratic action.

However, the complete reversal of the charge --from being called a Communistic destroyer of American institutions at the outset of the address to self-characterization as a liberal conservative and a safeguard of our institutions in the conclusion--was effective repudiation of the charge before the favorable audience and unacceptable argument to those radio listeners who did not grant his premises.

Ethical proofs

This address depended more directly than any other in the campaign upon the establishment of strong ethical proofs, for its sole purpose was to deny that Roosevelt was a Communist.

Although reference to his background and
the alignment of himself with honored leaders of the country who had been similarly attacked were effective steps toward accomplishment of his purpose, yet the chief ethical appeal came directly but powerfully from the major argument of his address—that his administration had removed the basis for growth of Communism in America. He could have offered no stronger proof for his repudiation of Communism than an administration whose main emphasis had undeniably been upon help to those in distress who, without this help, might have become Communists.

Roosevelt, also, showed himself the worthy leader of the people. His praise for the achievements in New York State of Al Smith, now his opponent, displayed his concern for the welfare of the people and his generosity to his critics. His presentation of Landon's claims by ludicrous imitation made his own seem the wiser by comparison.

The good will of his listeners was strongly solicited throughout the address by linking them with himself in his claims of action taken to rescue the nation from conditions leading to Communism.

Thus, whether Roosevelt was pointing to his reputation of past action against these conditions
of unrest, or praising other leaders who had taken similar steps, or warning the people against ones whose promises of action for social betterment could not be depended upon, he was building the ethical background for the belief that, rather than being a Communist, he had effectively led the nation away from such tendencies.

**Pathetic proofs**

It was natural that an address so pointed to personal exoneration should have an abundance of ethical proofs, and, perhaps, less of pathetic appeals than a speech seeking to lead the auditors in condemnation or acceptance of some policy. This contained throughout, however, a basic pathetic appeal of the power of government expended in the interests of the individual. Self-preservation, love of family and home, self-esteem—these basic drives were all involved in Roosevelt's pictures of the conditions conducive to Communism which his administration had eliminated.

The President appealed strongly to the pride of his listeners in their State by his identification of himself with them as native and former public servant, by his familiarity with their problems and progress and by his commendation of their leaders.
Therefore, Roosevelt directed his address in line with powerful drives within his auditors and secured thereby greater acceptance of his idea.

**Arrangement**

In contrast to the use of a single basic idea, as in the Philadelphia address, this speech depended particularly upon the progressive unfolding of the ideas. Having repudiated the false issue of his Communistic leanings, Roosevelt proceeded to clarify the real issue of the development of Communism in America by discussing three logical steps—the conditions under which it would develop; the comparison of the action of the opposing parties on these conditions; the certainty of Republican return to neglect of such conditions—steps leading to the conclusion that democracy was safest in Democratic hands. Therefore, because the conclusion lay several steps from the opening position and the audience needed clear guidance through them, arrangement played a vital part in the effectiveness of this address.

These three steps were necessary in arriving at the desired conclusion, and the order of their presentation was effective. An omission of the argument that the new Republican leadership was the same as the
old and would result in the same neglect of basic problems would have prevented this conclusion. Roosevelt's address, however, would have been strengthened by spending a greater share of his time on this argument. His emphasis upon the ineffectiveness of the former Republican administrations was weakened by allowing this vital logical element to remain mere assertion dealt with directly in the space of two sentences only. The order of ideas in the address was good, but the distribution of time, in this one regard, was somewhat ineffective.

Language

Since the Philadelphia address had been but elaboration of a single theme before an immense throng in an exalted mood, it was couched in artistic language on an elevated plane. The Syracuse address, however, was a fighting speech. It made much use of short thought-elements, which allow directness and vigor of approach to subject and audience, of rhetorical questions (which the Philadelphia address used not at all), of repetition. Throughout the address, use of specific words, first and second person pronouns, direct (rather than inverted) sentence order, and exclamatory expressions made possible rapid audience comprehension
of the ideas by their concentration of attention upon the important ones.

General appreciation of the theme would have provided a response of belief in the Philadelphia address; in the Syracuse speech, however, acceptance of the reasoned conclusion depended upon the following of the individual ideas as they were unfolded. The language of transition was particularly good, for at important turns of thought it clarified not only what had been done but designated clearly the relationship of the idea now to be taken up to the one concluded.

The power of language in setting the key of ideas was well illustrated in the episode of the "nice old gentleman wearing a silk hat," which lacked the informality of words and expressions which characterized the pass-key story of the Madison Square Garden address, but which used word-choice and sentence structure effectively in conveying the impression of ingratitude. Such usage, characteristic of Roosevelt's story-telling, added to the power of the ideas.

Delivery

The delivery of this address was vigorous both in assertion and in denial. Disdain, irony, bitter
scorn—these attitudes were expressed by vocal changes as well as by forceful words. Strong characterization of Roosevelt's position was variously obtained: by extent or suddenness of pitch change, by assumption of a comparatively high, thin voice for representation of Landon's words.

Even more effective in this address than pitch change was the varied use of force; emphasis through rate changes was less evident than in most of the Roosevelt speeches in this campaign.

Thus, Roosevelt, in this repudiation of Communism, followed an effective arrangement of ideas carefully articulated by transitional elements, vivified it for his hearers by vigorous utterance and by presentation of anecdote and paraphrase, and recommended it to the acceptance of Democrats everywhere by its praise of Democratic achievement. Although Roosevelt had not explained away the reason why the Communists were giving him their support in this campaign, he had done effective work in explaining relationships between unrest and Communism. Roosevelt had opened his active campaign with a vigorous attack on an issue which he hoped thereby to remove from the campaign.
The reactions to the speech

Laughter and applause had punctuated the President's address and, at the close, cheers and

Charles W. Hurd reported that "At times, when applause threatened to break a sentence at a point where its meaning would be lost, Mr. Roosevelt raised his voice and, with the aid of the amplifiers, talked over the applause." New York Times, September 30, 1936.

shouts broke out, and "these were renewed at his every gesture. The fierce joy of campaigning produced


Heywood Broun pointed out that "Not only does he understand the American system better than any of his predecessors in this respect, but he takes more joy out of the battle than anyone who has been on the same job." Washington News, October 22, 1936.

an address which was characterized as "a typical Roosevelt campaign speech, fighting spirit, resonant voice and all." Meeting an audience already pledged to him and

Literary Digest, 122: 6, October 10, 1936.

somewhat bored with the proceedings in which they had taken part, Roosevelt used a masterfully vigorous
This analysis, made by Charles W. Hurd (New York Times, October 4, 1936), seems at variance with the applause rendered the President; perhaps, the feeling resulted in a lower level of sentiment rather than in lack of demonstration.

Frederie W. Wile wrote that: "As the President abandoned the defensive note and assumed the aggressive he became the warrior unafraid and divested himself of one of the politically masterful and effective speeches he has yet broadcast." Washington Star, October 2, 1936.

He was pleased with his satirical touch in

Franklyn Waltman pointed out that the President's unparalleled understanding of public psychology and his flair for "impressing his personality on the public" had not become a commonplace during the four past years; rather "the Rooseveltian showmanship improved with time--becoming more artistic, more subtle and touched with a new Machivellian shrewdness." Washington Post, September 30, 1936.

Roosevelt's repudiation of Communistic support brought the most articulate reaction. Mark Sullivan pointed out that Roosevelt's very emphasis on this issue
would increase the public's consideration of the charge and that Roosevelt, by declaring himself no Communist, did not meet the contention that the Communists felt that his election would promote their distant objectives.

146New York Herald Tribune, October 1, 1936.
Although it is true that personal repudiation of the label of Communism did not meet this charge, it seems to the writer that the analysis of causes of Communism, although not drawn to its necessary ends, was an answer in this direction.

The President's claim that his repudiation of Communism was demonstrated by his "clear and consistent adherence" to the letter and spirit of the American form of government brought the natural denial of men who did not hold his basic interpretation of the function of government.

147Such comment appeared: "In any particular case it may perhaps be argued that such activities are socially desirable. It cannot be convincingly asserted that they accord with either the letter or the spirit of the American form of government." Washington Post, October 1, 1936.

Roosevelt's charge that Landon could not be a conservative in the East and a New Dealer in the West brought comment that he himself was inconsistent in his relationship to Red support through his backing of the
Farmer-Labor ticket in Minnesota, through his failure to remove Dubinsky as a Presidential elector in New York State, and through his retention of Tugwell among the presidential advisers.  

The Republican National Headquarters issued this statement prepared by the labor division: "While he repudiates communism, he has retained in his administration men like Tugwell, the so-called parlor pinks, the philosophical Communists, and given them carte blanche permission to perpetrate the communistic system upon the American people."  

John W. Davis, speaking under the auspices of the National Jeffersonian Democrats on October 20, 1936, claimed that the Constitution "has not been obeyed, either in letter or in spirit, during the last three years." He declared that taxation "for distributive, as distinct from governmental, purposes" was "communism
in all but name," and called for Democrats to speak up in defense of the old creed of "Democratic liberalism."

Al Smith related the arguments of his address of October 1, 1936, more directly to the President's own statements. He declared that the President was right about the "record at Albany" but declared that there were to differences from New Deal activities; that the acts were passed in accordance with the Constitution, and that they were prepared through conference and for the purpose of carrying out campaign promises. He would not, however, concede that Roosevelt had made good on his campaign promises, a decision which the President had wished the country to accept when he quoted his 1932 speech and claimed to have given the "workable program of reconstruction."

The speech seems to have served Democratic purposes well. Chairman Farley declared that the address had aroused great enthusiasm in Democratic ranks and that,
from then on, it would be a "fighting campaign" until election day. Warren Moscow reported that the party

leaders counted the President's address as extremely helpful to the ticket in New York State, and that Tammany and other New York City delegation leaders were enthusiastic, feeling that the speech gave the organizations an answer to take back to their home districts.

Franklyn Waltman pointed out three reasons for a questionable stand in New York State: that New York City was a money-center; that Tammany had been angered because Roosevelt and Farley had not "played with them"; and that Dubinsky was being retained as an elector. Washington Post, October 1, 1936.
Chapter III

THE ADDRESS AT FORBES FIELD, PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA, OCTOBER 1, 1936

The Background

Roosevelt's position on the budget

In Roosevelt's inaugural address of March 4, 1933, he had declared, "Through this program of action we address ourselves to putting our own national house in order and making income balance outgo."\(^1\) However,


this economy policy was reversed in the fall of that year when Roosevelt adopted the advice of John M. Keynes, the British economist who advocated the "steady expenditure of four hundred millions a month to furnish public purchasing power,"\(^2\) in opposition to that of Lewis W. Douglas, who counseled the balancing of the budget. When Douglas resigned as Director of the Budget in September, 1934, the actual wardenship of the budget was transferred to the President himself. In Roosevelt's Annual Budget Message to Congress of January 3, 1936, he had

declared, "...no new or additional taxes are proposed."\(^3\)

\(^3\)The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 31.

However, the invalidation of the processing taxes of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the demands of the new Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and of the soldiers' bonus upset his calculations; on March 3 he asked Congress for temporary taxation to cover the unforeseen expenses. On June 22 the undistributed profits tax on corporations was passed, giving some encouragement to small enterprises, but it antagonized business, which felt it a punitive measure.\(^4\)

\(^4\)Rauch, op. cit., pp. 228-229.

In August both Chairman Harrison of the Finance Committee\(^5\) and the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau\(^6\) brought out the possibility of an early balancing of the budget. In Roosevelt's revision of
budget, made on September 2, 1936, to reflect changes since his January statement, he adjusted both revenue and expenditure estimates upward. Editorial comment pointed out that Republicans were criticizing his use of unexpended balance for current expenses, that impartial observers were concerned over the $1,835,000,000 which the President still needed for relief, despite the improved business conditions, over the high amount for civil administration and over the omission of any accounting for the outlay called for by the present drought.  

7Ibid., pp. 15, 16, September 12, 1936, "Budget: Mr. Roosevelt's Pre-Election Figures Promise a Declining Deficit and a Rising Tax Bill."

The President admitted that additional funds for unemployment and drought relief might be necessary early in the next calendar year but declared, "It is confidently expected that any such requests for additional funds will amount to less than $500,000,000."  This figure was vigorously challenged.  


9John Taber, ranking Republican member of the House Appropriations Committee pointed out that all of the present funds would be exhausted by the middle of December,
1936, and that at least one billion dollars should be added to the President's estimate of a two billion dollar deficit for the fiscal year 1937. *New York Times*, September 3, 1936.

Attacks on Roosevelt's financial policies

During 1936 various challenges of the President's handling of financial affairs had been made by business and political leaders: that his administration had been characterized by extravagance,\(^{10}\) that the Federal use of

\(^{10}\)Hoover had declared before the Republican Women of Pennsylvania on May 14, 1936, "This cataract of wasteful expenditures should be stopped. The budget must be balanced." (*Vital Speeches*, 2: 556, June 1, 1936, "Constructive American Alternatives") In the Republican Party platform the governmental finance plank charged the Democratic administration with "shameful waste and general financial irresponsibility," demanded a balanced budget, and insisted that the taxing power of the Federal Government be used "for raising revenue and not for punitive or political purposes." (*New York Times*, June 14, 1936, "Cleveland Platform Shows Shift Since '32," R. L. Duffus) Landon's acceptance address at Topeka, Kansas, July 23, 1936, had declared, "We must be freed from excessive expenditure and crippling taxation. We must be freed from the effects of an arbitrary and uncertain monetary policy." Pointing out that the average taxpayer and his children would really be the ones to repay the borrowed billions so lavishly spent, he had declared, "Our party holds nothing to be of more urgent importance than putting our financial house in order." (*Vital Speeches*, 2: 667-668, August 1, 1936, "The Spirit of American Enterprise.") The Republican National Chairman, John Hamilton, asserted in New York City, June 22, 1936, that "such wanton flagrancy in expenditures must ultimately threaten our national credit and, in turn, the very substance of every charitable, educational and financial institution holding the bonds of the government, and, in addition, forecasts unbearable taxes to every citizen
and to future generations." Vital Speeches, 2: 612, July 1, 1936, "The Rebirth of the Republican Party."

money for the poorer states was an attempt at redistribution of wealth,\(^{11}\) that hidden taxes were mounting,\(^{12}\)

\(^{11}\)Raymond G. Carroll pointed out the scale on which this redistribution was occurring, citing the example of Mississippi, a state which would require "not less than 135 years to square its account," and of other poor states which were receiving large amounts from the revenues of other states. (The Saturday Evening Post, 209:23, August 22, 1936, "The Spenders.") John W. Davis, speaking under the auspices of the National Jeffersonian Democrats on October 20, 1936, declared, "Taxation for distributive, as distinct from governmental, purposes is as foreign an intruder into the body of Democratic or American doctrine as the expropriation of all property under a communistic regime. It is communism in all but name. The difference is one of degree only, not of principle." Vital Speeches, 3: 36, November 1, 1936, "Principles."

\(^{12}\)Among the frequent advocates of this challenge was Carl P. Dennett, Chairman of the National Economy League, speaking at the convention of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks on May 15, 1936. Mr. Dennett charged, "the Government is reaching deeper and deeper into the pockets of those of moderate means, and destroying their purchasing power and their savings—largely through hidden taxation." Ibid., 2: 545, June 1, 1936, "Are You a Savings Bank Depositor?"

that taxation of the wealthy and of the corporations would ultimately be paid by the poor,\(^{13}\) and that a

\(^{13}\)Colonel William J. Donovan, former candidate for governor of New York, in an address before the Women's National Republican Club of New York on May 17, 1936, declared, "The theory continuously advanced in one way or another that the rich can be made to pay the freight while the poor escape is just another cruel delusion."
(Ibid., p. 554, June 1, 1936, "The Case Against the New Deal") Ex-President Hoover, speaking in Denver on September 30, charged that the tax on undistributed corporation profits tended to "help the powerful instead of the weak..." (New York Times, October 1, 1936) The Republican vice-presidential candidate, Colonel Frank Knox, pointed out in a strong address before the West Virginia State Republican Convention on August 13, 1936, that "When corporations are taxed beyond reasonable limits the burden falls, not upon the stockholders, but upon the general public." Vital Speeches, 2: 748, September 1, 1936, "The Most Expensive Amateur Hour in History.

The burden of taxation was being laid upon this generation's children. A sensational issue arose from Frank Knox's declaration at Allentown, Pennsylvania, on September 5, 1936, that "The present administration has been for four years giving lip service to security and welfare, and today no life insurance policy is secure; no savings account is safe." Many interpreted this statement as declaring the financial standing of their own policies and accounts in question, rather than as pointing to the doubtful credit rating of a nation with an over-sized
national debt, as Knox claimed to have meant it. Secretary of Banking Harr of Pennsylvania threatened to proceed legally against Knox if he did not deny the charge; New York State Controller Tremaine called upon Knox to prove his charges or admit that he had made the statement "deliberately, perhaps maliciously, or for political expediency." 16 After the meeting of insurance executives and savings bank officials held at the White House on September 15, 1936, Mr. Williams, the president of Western and Southern Life Insurance Company, the spokesman of the group, declared:

I feel that the fight of the Federal Government through its various relief and public health agencies against want, disease and despair has been a great factor in helping this and other companies to overcome the effects of the depression and make continued progress.17

The favorable opinion reported by this group contrasted vividly with the views of other bankers.18

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid., September 16, 1936.

18 M. A. Linton, president of the Provident Mutual Life Insurance Company, declared in the current issue
of his company's magazine, "To maintain a sound currency a nation must live within its income." George V. McLaughlin, president of the Brooklyn Trust Company and former State Superintendent of Banking, pointed out that the largest percent a bank can lend to one borrower is 10% of capital and surplus, but that the average bank is now lending to the government through bond purchases no less than 320%. New York Herald Tribune, September 20, 1936.

On September 26, 1936, Landon had attacked the Social Security Act in an address in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. On the thirtieth he made public a hitherto unpublished report of the Twentieth Century Fund on the Roosevelt Administration Social Security Act, declaring this data to have been the basis of his attack the previous Saturday evening. Even so, James A. Hagerty pointed out that the report had prefaced the discussion of deficiencies with the statement that

In considering the inadequacies and shortcomings of the act full credit should be given to it as a real achievement and as a real foundation on which a satisfactory structure of old age security may eventually be built.19

19New York Times, October 1, 1936.

Change in Roosevelt's speaking plans

It is likely that the repeated hammerings of his opponents on the budget issue led Roosevelt to
widen his speaking program to include a speech on this problem.\textsuperscript{20} Undoubtedly this budget issue was one of the outstanding questions of the campaign.\textsuperscript{21} It was indeed natural that public opinion, once general recovery had taken place, would begin to question the sources of the government's munificence. Even the onset of renewed drought conditions throughout the Midwest was unlikely to throttle the general weariness in crusading; the return of reason with a degree of prosperity emphasized the question of the cost. The President, with his sensitivity to currents of popular thought,\textsuperscript{22} 

\textsuperscript{20}"The extension of his campaign appearances...indicated to political students that the President was going to concentrate more and more on a vigorous and persistent campaign....Pennsylvania is a particular battle-ground this year, with tremendous Democratic registration offsetting the traditional Republican strength, and thus the President's drive into the disputed territory will be watched with especial attention by both camps."	extit{Washington Post}, September 17, 1936.

\textsuperscript{21}Arthur Krock claimed that "From the autumn days of 1933, when the early economy policy of the administration was reversed and the spending experiment began, the President has realized the dangers of the budget issue in his campaign for reelection." \textit{New York Times}, August 16, 1936.

\textsuperscript{22}Henry Wallace explained that Roosevelt "played his politics by ear." \textit{(New Republic}, 114:545, April 15, 1946)
In his editorial of October 17, 1942, Raymond Clapper declared: "Mr. Roosevelt has always shown what seems to me a sure intuition that approaches genius in the field of democratic leadership, in sensing the needs of the times and leading the country toward them." *Watching the World, 1934-44*, p. 93.

may well have felt that a dynamic answer was due. Furthermore, his new opponent, Al Smith, was speaking over the national radio chains that evening and Colonel Knox was to speak in Pittsburgh itself. Roosevelt himself had spoken in Pittsburgh on the budget issue on October 19, 1932, condemning the Hoover administration vigorously for its economic policy, "a veritable cancer in the body politic and economic," and promising to "reduce the cost of current Federal Government operations by twenty-five percent" with reservation that if the people's need required additional funds he would ask for them.23


It seemed peculiarly fitting that Roosevelt should address the nation at that place and time on the budget issue. It was postulated that the President would also discuss the labor issue in this industrial center.24

24 John C. O'Brien surmised that "At Pittsburg, heart of the mill as well as the coal district, the
President presumably will make the major labor speech of the campaign. A good deal of spade work already has been done among labor unions by Mr. Lewis and Major George L. Berry, the President's coordinator for Industrial Cooperation. They have promised the President a plurality of 200,000 in Pennsylvania, but they concur in Mr. Farley's idea of having the President make his own bid for labor support in Pennsylvania's strongest labor city. "New York Herald Tribune, September 20, 1936.

It is to be remembered that only two evenings before this Pittsburgh address the President had delivered a fiery speech at Syracuse, New York, in which he opened his campaign with a vigorous attack on the Communism issue. The persuasive appeals of that speech upon the national audience may well have conditioned great numbers of Americans to an enthusiastic reception of this address which followed the other so closely. The drama of the situation—Knox speaking only four blocks away, and Smith waiting to address the nation from New York as soon as the President completed his speech—added interest to the speaking occasion.

The Audience

It is likely that the arrangement for Roosevelt to address the nation from Pittsburgh from 9:00 to 9:30 p.m. and for Al Smith, Roosevelt's bitter opponent in this campaign, to speak to the national audience
from New York from 9:30 to 10:00 p.m. increased the radio audience for both by its dramatic juxtaposition. Because the speeches were thus natural foils for each other, probably both speakers had even more opponents among their listeners than would otherwise have been the case.25

25 Landon and Hoover listened to Roosevelt's address at a dinner given by reporters in Topeka and then retired to the Executive Mansion to hear Smith's address. New York Times, October 2, 1936.

Thus, Roosevelt's radio audience undoubtedly included many adherents of the Republican views who wished to hear his policies attacked by an erstwhile Democrat, as well as by increased numbers of his own followers. Perhaps the fighting nature of his Syracuse speech had convinced other listeners that his speeches during the campaign would thereafter be "good show."

Roosevelt's immediate audience gathered at Forbes Field, the National League baseball field, only four blocks from the Duquesne Gardens where Republican party managers predicted that ten thousand people would congregate to hear Frank Knox speak between 8:15 and 8:45, assembled some 60,000 to 75,000 strong.26 An

26 Party leaders had predicted an audience of 20,000 if the weather was fair. Charles W. Hurd reported that
enthusiastic crowd of men, women, and children occupied every one of the 45,000 seats, jammed all the aisles and standing room; behind police lines, on the ball field surged other thousands, and outside the entrance gates milled other clamoring, disappointed thousands.27


Arthur Krock pointed out that commentators were agreed that the President was speaking this evening in territory which he was certain to win in November.28 This giant audience was an "exultant, cheering, hilarious"29

28 Ibid., October 2, 1936.

29 Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936, Kermit McFarland.

throng, a throng made up of "common people."30 Particularly

30 "To any man familiar with political history who was at Forbes Field it was indeed a time for soliloquy and wonder. "It was not alone the size of the crowd and its enthusiasm which gave pause to the man who observed it closely. It was the plain evidence that it was made up almost entirely of what usually are described as the
common people—the people who have the bulk of the votes in this country.

"That probably was the outstanding feature of the entire demonstration from a practical political standpoint." (Ibid., October 2, 1936, John B. Townley.)

It was a "mammoth planned reception," (New York Times, October 4, 1936, Charles W. Hurd) a rally which Governor Earle characterized as "the greatest ever held in this city." Ibid., October 2, 1936, Charles W. Hurd.

important was the group-seating which resulted from the convention nature of the gathering. The extent of

"Forbes Field was dotted with political banners of all sizes, shapes and descriptions. One large banner announced that 'Erie County for Roosevelt by 10,000'. Another simply said, 'He saved,' while a third declared, 'President Roosevelt, We are With You.' Each community, as well as the outlying counties, had banners announcing their identification." Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936, Kermit McFarland.

previous polarization and the power of social facilitation were at their maximum with these organized groups desirous of outdoing each other in showing approval of
the speaker and his pronouncements. A speaker facing such an organized audience has the opportunity of setting off these desired expressions of approval by all the methods at his command; it is his obligation to satisfy the audience by their own demonstrations and also encourage them on to greater proofs of their unanimity and devotion.

It is likely that the Pittsburgh audience contained large contingents of miners. Doubtless the United Mine Workers were well aware that at the close of the President's speech the president of District No. 5 was to make a surprise award to the speaker. Philip Murray, vice president of the United Mine Workers, was among those seated on the platform; this recognition of labor as an effective force among Pennsylvanian Democrats argues the presence of delegations largely or wholly labor in composition. John L. Lewis had declared in June that the miners had "abiding faith" in Roosevelt;\(^33\)

\(^33\) Lewis had pointed out Roosevelt's "unceasing diligence" for the welfare of the miners and had concluded this to be the reason for labor support; "It would be base ingratitude for labor to take any other course in the 1936 campaign and election." Philadelphia Record, June 23, 1936.

hence, these delegations were doubtless flattered by their idol's arrangement to speak to them and were eager
to prove their enthusiasm and gratitude.

Thus, Roosevelt faced an audience in Pittsburgh which was already strongly favorable to him and desirous of demonstrating this favor, and spoke to a radio audience with an unusual proportion of extremely attentive antagonists.

The Immediate Setting of the Speech

The size and compactness of the crowd gathered at the Democratic rally were significant factors in the speaking situation.\(^5\) These thousands were assembled

\[\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\text{Charles W. Hurd declared, "Everything about the reception accorded the President required superlatives in description." }\text{New York Times, October 2, 1936.}\]

in the huge ball stadium on "a chilly, clear evening following a day of rain;"\(^6\) a bright moon was now shining

\[\text{\textsuperscript{6}}\text{Ibid.}\] out and the air was so crisp that a speaker's breath could be seen.\(^7\) Such an auspicious turn of the weather

\[\text{\textsuperscript{7}}\text{Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936, Kermit McFarland.}\]

could not fail to be reflected in the spirits of the crowd. A dozen bands were there to increase the hilarity of the
throng whose parade hats, flags and banners were indicative of the nature of their participation. The speaker's stand was erected over second base, and above the huge ball park stand was "an illuminated portrait of the President, about forty feet high and labeled, 'He Saved America.'" The ethical value of this visible declaration accompanying the striking portraiture of the honored person was undeniable. This detail was doubtless effective as a transfer device, identifying the American spirit with Roosevelt's candidacy. Thus, auditory, visual and kinesthetic factors united in strong suggestion of gratitude and enthusiasm for the speaker.


38 Robert T. Oliver pointed out that "polarization" of the audience may be increased by "the free use of symbols." (op. cit., p. 172) Oliver also declared that the appearance of the hall had significance: "It should be orderly and symbolically effective, and contribute to the creation of the right atmosphere." Ibid., p. 109.

39 "The object is to transfer to the candidate the favorable emotional attitudes, elicited by the prayer, the flags, the uniforms and the martial music." Institute for Propaganda Analysis, I, No. 2: 1-3, November, 1937.
The President arrived at the field at 8:45 p.m. He was driven around a part of the infield under a motorcycle escort. Ahead of him went a costumed Uncle Sam leading a donkey. Fred W. Perkins reported that a "great roar arose" as his car drove out onto the field and that "the crescendo was increased as he mounted the speakers' platform. But when he stepped to the microphones wave upon wave of sustained cheering split the cool night air." As the President waited for the air lanes to be cleared at nine o'clock, a band played "Happy Days are Here Again." Then the President removed his topcoat, laid aside his hat and "squared himself for a fighting speech." Governor Earle had just completed his address at this largest political rally that the

Governor Earle had been one of the six governors who had spoken on the NBC program in July declaring that Landon's promises were only repetitions of Roosevelt's accomplishments. Earle had characterized Landon's
promises as "vague, far-reaching, indefinite generalities" and had asserted that Landon was closely linked to the steel industry through his uncle, William T. Mossman. *New York Times*, July 29, 1936.

city had ever seen; now David L. Lawrence, Secretary

It is to be remembered that Pennsylvania had long given her electors to the Republican candidates, but in 1936 the Democrats were gaining favor, especially among the laborers. Arthur Krock wrote: "Republican Pennsylvania is now admittedly the most fertile field for Democratic vote-sowing. Although for many years the industrial and white collar workers lived contentedly under Republican domination, the President has won away an overwhelming percentage and the electoral division of the classes is nowhere more definite than in the transmontane counties of Pennsylvania." Ibid., October 2, 1936.

of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, quieted the band

David L. Lawrence is not to be confused with David Lawrence, the Associated Press correspondent and the author in 1935 of *Stumbling into Socialism*.

and introduced the President. Roosevelt "drank a glass of water, adjusted his nose glasses, and stepped to the microphones." These evidences of readying himself

made the audience aware that all were approaching the moment when the vigorous, confident expression of their commonly-held beliefs would begin. The psychological effect of waiting until exactly nine o'clock, the hour
when the President's listeners all over the land would be turning their dials to hear him, gave increased stature to this group at the hub of the event as well as to the activator of it all. The audience was likely enjoying the poise of the speaker. 47 And the suggestion that the man

47 "The persuasive speaker aids his cause when his audience enjoys empathizing with him." J. T. Oliver, op. cit., p. 138.

there before them had saved the country was heard in the band music, seen in the banners, sensed in the immensity of the crowd, and continuously before their eyes in the illuminated likeness and its momentous claim in three short words.

Of course, there were distracting elements which tended to destroy this polarization, and which the speaker had to meet in retaining the attention of his listeners. The audience had already heard an address by Governor Earle so the freshness of the speaking situation had been removed. The evening was chilly and the crowd large, hence, a certain amount of shuffling was to be expected. Many of the listeners were wearing parade hats, and the attitude of hilarity and exuberance might be as much a cause of inattention as would an attitude of indifference have been. It was to the President's credit
that he was able to take the crowd as it was, with polarizing and distracting elements intermingled, and make of it a responsive listening group. Thus, surroundings were immensely important in the attitudes and polarization of the audience which Roosevelt faced at Forbes Field.

The radio audience heard the words of the Pittsburgh announcer,48 the brief words of introduction spoken by the chairman, Mr. Lawrence49 then prolonged cheering.

48"Good Evening, Ladies and Gentlemen:
The following program is presented under the sponsorship of the Democratic National Committee. A record throng of sixty thousand people is assembled at Forbes Field in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, tonight to hear the President of the United States deliver another address in his campaign for reelection.
The double-decker stands of the Pittsburgh Ball Club's stadium, built to seat thirty-eight thousand, are jammed to capacity, and the thousands of temporary chairs placed on the infield are all filled. People are standing along the sidelines of the big athletic field, all eager to hear President Roosevelt and get a glimpse of him as he speaks.
And now we introduce the chairman of the Pennsylvania State Democratic Committee, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Mr. Lawrence." Taken by this writer from a transcription of this address made by the National Broadcasting Company.

49"My fellow [cheers] my fellow Pennsylvanians: It is my very great privilege at this time to present the President of the United States." Ibid.
followed by the radio announcer's voice. Such a sample

50 "It's a happy, smiling, waving President who stands now by the microphone to carry his voice to a waiting nation, receiving the enthusiastic cheers of his fellow-Americans here in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania." Ibid.

of the crowd's reactions and the President's joyous appearance undoubtedly conditioned the mental set of the favorable radio listeners, impressing them with Roosevelt's enthusiastic reception by a huge audience and flattering them with a feeling of being present by proxy; probably this same joyousness further displeased his opponents.

During the speech there were many demonstrations of approval with energetic waving of flags and hats, and at its close the President received a prolonged ovation.


In fact, Kermit McFarland reported that, when the President closed his address with a striking sentence declaring the nation's sound status, the crowd "rose to its feet as a man and stamped a tremendous roaring, heartfelt "amen' on the echo of his words." 52 As Mr. Roosevelt started to

52 Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936.

leave the platform, Chairman Lawrence quieted the shouting
throng to present Patrick Fagan, president of District No. 5 of the United Mine Workers. He addressed the President as "the greatest humanitarian of all times." 53


and presented to him a gold medal "emblematic of appreciation for what the President has done for the miners of the country." Furthermore, Mr. Fagan told the crowd that with the medal, "I present him with the 40,000 votes of the miners in District No. 5 and the votes of every union coal miner in America." 54 Mr. Roosevelt took the medal with a serious smile and said:

That medal means a great deal to me, away down in my heart. I don't deserve what Mr. Fagan said, but I have tried for years to get a square deal for the miners of America. 55

54 Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936, Kermit McFarland.

55 Ibid. The New York Times (October 2, 1936) reported that the President's last sentence ended thus: "...a square deal not only for the miners, but for every man and woman working with their hands." Such conflict of report cannot be resolved under the impromptu and highly emotional conditions of the utterance.

The President's having won such an award from the miners and then having received it in such a deeply personal manner are examples of the personal quality of his
leadership. The booming applause burst out again, and

56 He had told the nation in his acceptance address in June, "We seek not merely to make Government a mechanical implement, but to give it the vibrant personal character that is the very embodiment of human charity." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 235.

Mr. Roosevelt shook hands with Mr. Fagan and Philip Murray, vice-president of the United Mine Workers of America.57

57 "Tumult broke out, lapsed like a man holding his breath until the President's ear pointed through the entrance, then burst out again in an uproar as unanimous as it was thunderous." Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936, Kermit McFarland.

The Pittsburgh audience gave the President vigorous approval of himself and his speech.

At the close of the address the radio audience heard the announcer's voice rise above the prolonged applause and gay strains of "Happy Days are Here Again" with brief closing words. 58 And no member of the radio audience could have failed to notice the strong note of
approval from the Pittsburgh audience for the President and his message.

The speaker's own attitude toward the occasion and his address must be taken into account. His route to Pittsburgh had taken him by train through the heart of the bituminous coal country, a region in which his degree of popularity was expected by Democratic leaders "to give him at least an even chance to carry the State of Pennsylvania." 59 This day of vigorous campaigning included


a fifty-mile motor drive through West Virginia, a short campaign address at Elkins, West Virginia, and several platform appearances in that state and in Pennsylvania on the way to Pittsburgh. During this trip the President received a telegram with news which he could not hold back to his formal evening address at Pittsburgh. He said at Fairmont, West Virginia, and at each of the other stops thereafter in some form:

I received a telegram a few moments ago on the train and through you good people I am going to make an announcement about it. The telegram reports that for the first time in fifty-years we have completed one full year without a single national bank failure in the United States. From that, I am inclined to think that the banks of the United States are safer than they have been in fifty-five
Perhaps the President's warm reception in the regions through which he passed and this highly gratifying news were the justifiable sources of Roosevelt's happiness during the journey. When he reached Pittsburgh,

sixty Pennsylvania State Troopers on motor cycles preceded his automobile as it made its way along the close-packed thoroughfares. Thousands cheered him enthusiastically on his twenty-minute ride along four miles of crowded streets to Forbes Field. There was no doubt that the President was both happy and exhilarated when he arrived at the speaking platform there.

The President's address was not completed until a couple of hours before his arrival in Pittsburgh, although the main lines had been laid out several days before and one complete draft of the full speech written.

He had planned to give much of October first, the day of
his address, to revision but other engagements so filled his time that his hours of work on the speech were cut short.63 Receipt of messages from Washington at frequent

63"In the last hour on which he worked on the address Mr. Roosevelt kept four secretaries busy taking dictation, typing and submitting back to him paragraphs he had given them, revising, and, finally, mimeographing the speech on a machine set up in a drawing room on the 'work car' of his private train." New York Times, October 2, 1936, Charles W. Hurd.

intervals caused him to change words here and there and sometimes entire sentences,64 the most exciting and

64Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936, Fred W. Perkins.

gratifying message being the news of the year without a national bank failure. Correspondents travelling with the President received copies of the address only forty-five minutes before the Presidential party left the train for the car trip to Forbes Field. This release so late as 7:45 P.M.65 may have been arranged to put the speech in circulation no more than one half hour before Knox was to begin his address at Duquesne Gardens in Pittsburgh and one hour and a quarter before his own radio presentation would have made it available to Al Smith

in New York City. It is thus unlikely that either opponent had access to Roosevelt's address before delivering his own speech on the evening of October 1, 1936.

Hence, a President whose enjoyment of campaigning was widely known stood at the close of a day of praise from cheering thousands before an audience whose banners proclaimed their devotion to him, bringing news which he had delighted in telling throughout the day. Little wonder that he looked confident and powerful as he approached a situation so full of satisfactions for him.

"Mr. Roosevelt's demeanor, as he addressed the vast audience, was one of supreme confidence, cheerful optimism and four-square determination." Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936, Kermit McFarland.

The Speech

Roosevelt's salutation closed with the words,

He addressed the Chairman, David L. Lawrence, and
Governor Earle, who had been elected the first Democratic governor of Pennsylvania in forty-four years. As one of the six governors chosen to help answer Landon's acceptance address by radio, Governor Earle had called his promises "vague, far-reaching, indefinite generalities." New York Times, July 29, 1936.

"my friends of Pennsylvania," a variation of the well-known phrase, and a stereotype which called forth the ready cheers of his audience. This strong release of feeling added to the polarization of the audience which had been previously achieved by the physical surroundings, introductory speech and music.

Roosevelt set out at once to establish his analogy between the financial record of his administration
and a box score, declaring that a "ball park" was "a
good place to talk about box scores." This comparison

This analogy was basically effective in this situa-
tion of making a speech in a ball park. Undoubtedly many
of Roosevelt's listeners had attended games at this stadium;
probably many could see the scoreboard from their present
positions; it is probable that the feelings of strong,
hero-worshiping advocacy and of pleasant hilarity arising
out of these past associations were, to some extent,
transferred to the present occasion.

underlies the argument of the entire address; it claims
that the nation expels and retains its leadership under
the same conditions that baseball does. The President

The pattern of the analogy is as follows:

I. Government finance records are comparable to
   baseball scoreboards, for
   A. If the score is unsatisfactory, leadership
      is changed.
   B. If the score is satisfactory, leadership
      should be retained.

had found a way to dramatize the dullest governmental
topic--the budget. By use of colloquial language--

Charles W. Hurd declared: "Not a little of the
favorable response of the crowd and its enthusiasm was
ascribed by observers to the fact that Mr. Roosevelt
humanized an otherwise dry discussion of the deficit by
couching his remarks in baseball terminology at the

"tell you the story," "And from where I stand it looks
as if the game is pretty well in the bag"—Roosevelt made a prediction pleasant to his receptive labor audience and established a favorable attitude toward his discussion. His declaration of the simplicity of finance when it is honest, couched in language with the plain folks touch,75

75He disclaimed any "higher mathematics" and declared, "It's just plain, scoreboard arithmetic."

flattered the listener by implying his right to understand.76

76The limited education and non-professional status of mine laborers might well engender deep desires for recognition of intelligence. Such a group would willingly proclaim the leadership of one who could "put the vague longings of the crowd into a definite credo..." Oliver, op. cit., p. 84.

Then the President swung into the first argument of his address by use of his baseball terminology,77 holding

77Roosevelt had served as manager of the baseball team during his final year at Groton. Early Years, p. 322.

the thesis that the "change of management" had been voted to give the nation a "chance to win the game," and stating the generalization that the game was now being won.78

78The sense of achievement may well have been especially
strong among Pennsylvania Democrats in 1936 because the Democratic registration had been so challenging to the traditional Republican strength that both parties were alert to happenings in the state. Doubtless the listeners at Forbes Field were proud of their increasing power.

The problem to be met was great

Roosevelt argued that the situation in 1933 prevented increased taxation but demanded increased government expenditures. He reconstructed the "crisis"

79 The framework of argument in this address is as follows:

I. The government has a praiseworthy box score.
   A. The government's choice of borrowing was justified.
      1. The problem to be met was great.
         a. Declining national income had brought unemployment and distress to business and banks.
         b. Increased taxation could not meet the problem of unemployment.
      2. The government could not assume a let-alone policy.
         a. Property ownership would have been further concentrated.
         b. The President had promised to prevent starvation.
         c. Local communities could not longer solve the problem.
         d. Private business could not solve the problem.
      3. It stopped the decline of national income, and restored purchasing power.
         a. No bank failure occurred during the past year.
         b. Industry flourished again.
B. The amount of expenditure was justified.
   1. Assets exist to offset much of the expenditure.
   2. The plan is superior to the sending of billions overseas, as was done in the Hoover administration.
   3. The plan is superior to the spending of 25 billion in two years of war.
   4. Expenditure will be paid out of increase in national income rather than from present savings or children's earnings.

conditions vividly in simple terms of the people's own experiences, defined his term, "national income," and

Roosevelt's power of phrasing is evidenced in depiction of the crisis as consisting of actions taking place and events happening to people. Genung spoke of one of the elements of beauty of style as "that fine correspondence of work and movement to the sense and spirit of discourse." Op. cit., p. 39.

The colloquial language, "By national income I mean," and the double approach of stating the total persons affected and then the transactions in which they would be affected--these were powerful in ethical appeal because of their painstaking attempt at clearness.

supported his argument as to the severity of the problem by specifying the fall in income as being from eighty-one billion to thirty-eight billion, a drop of forty-one billion dollars. His further argument that tax revenue

The Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1936, shows the national income of 1929 as $81,934,000,000 and of 1932, $39,545,000,000. (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1936, p. 264). It is not known why Roosevelt changed the decline from the forty-three billion dollars of his manuscript (The Public
necessarily falls with a fall in national income and that balancing the Federal budget must wait upon the return of public prosperity was fallacious when thus simplified because it ignores counteracting factors. It was,

nevertheless, rhetorically strong through its varied repetition of the idea of the simple tie-up between the people's prosperity and the government's financial status. Homely phraseology, such as "on the down-grade," and parallelism of word and phrase assisted in clarity. The
conclusion anticipated the following argument, for Roosevelt's reasoning has shown clearly the relation between the people's and the government's financial welfare but has not shown that the government must, of necessity, assume the people's problem.84 His conclusion of this phase was a question in colloquial terms—"That makes common sense, doesn't it?"—a request for confirmation from the audience85 that brought cries of "yes, yes" and strong applause.86

84This contention, that the duty of balancing the people's budget lay with the government, was attacked by John W. Davis, speaking under the auspices of the National Jeffersonian Democrats on October 20, 1936: "Surely it is neither humanitarian nor Democratic nor American to indoctrinate the people of the United States with the idea that it is the duty of the government to support the citizen, rather than the duty of the citizen to support the government." Vital Speeches, 2: 36, November 1, 1936, "Principles."

85Earlier in the address Roosevelt had asked approval through prolongation of words and pronounced stress on closing phrases; this verbal request was even more direct. Kermit McFarland reported: "At times as he scored point after point in his speech he turned to platform associates and smiled a triumphant smile, as though to say, 'Let 'em try that on their piano.' At other times, as the crowd cheered an endorsement, he stood solemnly and seriously, waiting for the applause to cease." Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936.

86Roosevelt's volatile audience, which "cheered almost every sentence" (New York Times, October 2, 1936,
Charles W. Hurd), and he, in his high spirits, were sparks to each other's kindling, and an unusual interplay of audience and speaker took place.

Roosevelt posed the three billion debt accumulation of the Hoover administration as a further reason for the rejection of taxes as the answer to the balancing of the budget, an argument strong in its condemnation of Hoover but weak in the thinking of any listener who had been impressed by the debt accumulation of the speaker's administration.

The government could not assume a let-alone policy.

Roosevelt used the element of contrast strongly in presenting the choice which his government had to make, establishing the idea of having been strongly urged to take no action as a frame-work for word-pictures which enforced his decision against that policy. The first picture contrasted the concentration of property ownership which would have resulted from the do-nothing policy.

That Roosevelt pointed to the Roman Empire as an
historical example of over-concentration is significant in the light of references to Roman history made recently by his opponents. Hoover, referring to the weakening of the legislative arm," had declared on May 14, 1936, in Philadelphia, "For two hundred years the Roman Senate lingered on as a social distinction and as a scene of noisy prattle after it had surrendered its real responsibilities to personal government." (Vital Speeches, 2: 559, June 1, 1936, "Constructive American Alternatives.") Frank Knox had also used a reference to Roman history in his address to the West Virginia State Republican Convention, August 13, 1936, "The road of history is strewn with the wrecks of nations engulfed by waste of the people's money. The Roman Republic collapsed under the weight of taxes." (Ibid., p. 748, September 1, 1936, "The Most Expensive Amateur Hour in History.") Thus, his incidental reference to Roman concentration of wealth stands in the nature of rebuttal.

with the program of protection insisted upon by his administration. This contrast was valid, for Roosevelt had taken steps to lighten the burden of debt by restoring buying power through the raising of price levels.89

89 "At one time or another, the New Deal used the following methods to raise prices: 1. By devaluation of the dollar and an increase in the amount of currency outstanding. 2. By gold purchases from abroad. 3. By seeking to establish parity prices...for agriculture.... 4. By codes of fair competition in industry, to eliminate price cutting." Hacker, op. cit., p. 201.

This contrast was vivid, for Roosevelt used strong "eulogy of the people" in designating these groups as the "backbone of America."

The second picture presented the President's determination to keep the people from starvation, specifying
the breadlines which the "do-nothing" policy would have brought back and rejecting as heartless the balancing of the budget at that time. He supported this rejection by a vividly phrased dilemma: to balance the budget in the first three years would have meant either of these unacceptable alternatives—to assess a confiscatory capital levy, or to ignore the suffering of the people. 90

90 The power of Biblical phrasing, of simple words and of terse statement made this idea forceful.

Roosevelt's opponents, however, were pointing out in this campaign that he had missed a third possibility—that of reducing government expenditure—a more severe omission in that he had made such a promise. Roosevelt was correct in that neither of the alternatives he had listed could have been accepted. He defended the decision of an active policy by explaining that the local communities were unable to meet the problem 91 and that

91 Rauch declared, "Private charity in even the richest districts was unable to meet the need, and local and state governments were exhausting their credit. The drought-ridden farmers merely presented the problem in the most acute form; local relief was unable to save them from starvation." Op. cit., p. 18.

private business declared itself powerless to solve it.
This was argument by elimination of other possible agencies for affording relief, and it was valid, at least if the Roosevelt premise that government existed to do what the people needed done be allowed. Roosevelt's quick summary of the New Deal's program with its claim of courage in contrast to the cowardice of the preceding administration was motivative proof to his labor audience in Pittsburgh but anathema to those radio listeners who opposed him.92

92His opponents were unwilling to grant him the credit for the recovery. For example, editorial comment pointed out that historical examples of revival from depressions in the United States warranted the following conclusion, that "half a dozen years after a financial crash will largely complete the unavoidable process of liquidation and readjustment," and referred to the fact that "the first prolonged and sustained industrial revival from the recent depression began in 1935." New York Times, September 13, 1936.

The President's argument for his decision of borrowing is climaxed by a strongly iterated affirmation that the expenditure of money was with the people's knowledge and consent,93 a declaration of comradeship.

93The Governors of many of the states, meeting in Washington in March, 1933, had declared: "He is ready to lead if we are ready to follow. He needs the united support of all our people in carrying out his plans." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. II, p. 21.
strong in pathetic appeal to those who favored his administration and irritating in its repetitive insistence to those who condemned it.

Roosevelt's argument on the necessity of borrowing had proceeded through four steps: taxation could not meet the problem, but the problem had to be met, and neither the local communities nor the private businesses were able to meet it. Vivid use of personal pronouns, word-pictures, contrast, repetition, stylistic excellence in word-choice, and vocal emphasis had enforced these logical proofs.

The amount of expenditure was justified

Swift transition to the second large aspect of his proof with the colloquial expression, "All right, my friends, let's look at the cost." Further prepara-

94 Frances Perkins pointed out that Roosevelt's mind worked like that of the ordinary person; she declared, "His emotions, his intuitive understanding, his imagination, his moral and traditional bias, his sense of right and wrong— all entered into his thinking... His way was that of the common man as opposed to the intellectual and uncommon man. The common people understood Franklin Roosevelt and he understood them, largely, I think, because their processes of looking at things and coming to conclusions were almost the same." Op. cit., pp. 153-154.

...
of Hoover's increase with the characterization of having had "little to show for it," a light in which comparison with his results would present his increase more favorably than mere juxtaposition of the figures would have done. His words "much to show for it" gathered power and impressiveness from their firm tone and measured rate.95

95Kermit McFarland pointed out that "Experienced observers agreed F. D. Roosevelt was in his best form. He drove home dynamically each point in his many-pointed speech." Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936.

Having thus prepared easy acceptance with a suggestible audience for his argument on the debt increase, he retained his direct, personal, investigative approach and returned to the analogy of the scoreboard.96

96The Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1934, reports an increase in public debt from June, 1929, to June, 1932, of $2,555,812,000 (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1934, p. 194). Doubtless expenditures of the first half of 1933 justified the three billion figure. The Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1937, showed an eleven billion dollar increase from June, 1933, to June, 1936; Since the 1932-1933 fiscal year during which the change of administration occurred brought an increase of three billion, likely consideration of this additional half year would have brought the eleven billion figure to thirteen billion dollars. Roosevelt's use of the eight billion figure is explained later in the address.

This graphic treatment of the problem97 centered attention

97This method of centering a group's attention on
a problem for common consideration of it was characteristic of Roosevelt. In January, 1942, Raymond Clapper attended a conference of Washington correspondents with the President explaining the war budget. Clapper said, "More important to me than anything he said was the fact that he was holding the conference, or seminar, as he calls it." Watching the World, 1934-44, p. 96.

on the figures and their specific allocation. Choosing first the bonus, an easily explainable item and one

98 The President's argument that the government now had the bonus payments "out of the way" was challenged as untrue by Governor Landon in that the payment had been made in bonds, redeemable in the future; the challenge was answered for the Democratic National Committee by an economist, Arthur M. Lamport, who explained that a high percentage of the veterans' certificates had been paid in cash from the general cash fund and were "out of the way." New York Herald Tribune, October 9, 1936.

for which Roosevelt had not been immediately responsible,99

99 He had vetoed the bonus bill twice, but in this address he inferred that the decision made during his administration to pay the bonus in 1936 instead of 1945 was a good one. The applause which interrupted his statement and continued at its close showed that his listeners attributed their receipt of bonus payments during the past half year to his administration and, thus, to him without further thought.

he accomplished justification of "over a billion and a half." His declaration that "As for the other six and a half billions we didn't just spend money—we spent money for something" allowed the President another swift characterization of the achievements of his administration
and a contrast with his opponents who were "selling America short."\textsuperscript{100} This contrast is strongly brought out in the words "selling America short" as balanced against "investing in the future of America," a phrase which was spoken firmly and proudly.\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{100}This is an apt phrase in characterization of the timid Hoover policy, especially because the former president had appealed to Wall Street and to the commodity exchanges to stop "short-selling," the very practice upon which the existence of exchanges depends. Rauch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{101}Charles W. Hurd pointed out that "Conscious of the friendly reaction of the crowd, he indicated by his manner as he progressed through his speech that he felt downright pride in the facts he could report." (\textit{New York Times}, October 2, 1936) This phrase served also as a very effective summarization of the allocation of these billions, or the specific projects he had mentioned. Genung explained that "A very serviceable management of this kind of repetition consists in expanding the sense until the thought is exhibited on its various sides, and then contracting it into its most pointed and striking form." (\textit{Op cit.}, p. 465) Whately declared, "The hearers will be struck by the forcibleness of the sentence which they will have been prepared to comprehend. They will understand the longer expression, and remember the shorter." \textit{Elements of Rhetoric}, p. 351.

The second comparison that Roosevelt presented reflected credit on his use of the six and one half billion in two ways--in its results and in its total amount. He claimed that the fourteen billion sent abroad between 1920 and 1930 brought the threat of war, the competition
of factories and foreign "boondoggling." This appeal to the deep human drive of self-preservation likely reduced any feeling against his expenditure held by any listeners who were uncritical of this analogy. It was psychologically effective procedure to emphasize the "hard-earned" nature of these dollars just as the audience had been hit with the fact that they had been

---

102 Roosevelt's reasoning was challenged as fallacious through its comparison of non-identical elements. Arthur Curtis, Assistant to Chairman Hamilton of the Republican Party, characterized this analogy "a deliberate misplay" and said that "the Federal Government did not loan one-hundredth part of this sum from 1920 to 1930. Money for foreign loans during this period came from the pockets of private workers—not from the pockets of small wage-earning taxpayers. One small loan was made to Greece for humanitarian reasons, totalling less than President Roosevelt has spent on an unused Florida ship canal." (New York Times, October 3, 1936) The same contention was made in the editorial column of the New York Herald Tribune of October 5, 1936. That these elements are non-identical is a matter interpretation. Roosevelt's thinking involved no such discrepancy because his point was that they were American dollars, not that they were public or private dollars. To him the distinction would not have been important; to his opponents this distinction was the crux of the whole matter. Another charge of fallacy lay in his statement of the uses of the money abroad and his claim that most of it was "gone for good." The New York Times pointed out that much of the money had been spent for useful and self-supporting enterprises" and declared that on only fifteen percent had payment been completely suspended. (October 5, 1936) Likely very little of this reasoning occurred to his favorable audience at Pittsburgh; doubtless all of it struck his antagonists forcibly, impressing them more fully of their belief that he combined unrelated materials to support his own conclusions.
used for the benefit of foreigners, and to declare that they were now "gone for good." These short, trip-hammer blows in colloquial language were followed by a rhetorical question which described the eight billion expenditure again as "investment" and threw into sharp contrast with the foreign losses his spending of eight billion for American purposes. Roosevelt's strongly uttered

103 Repetition of the word "American" with attention-garnering vocal force stressed the comparison.

insistence that his expenditures had served American purposes held pathetic appeal through its reference to group ideals and, consequently, ethical appeal through increased prestige for the leader who served the group ideals.

Roosevelt's figure of eight billion had now been defended in contrast to Hoover's three billion, had been reduced in appearance by contrast with the fourteen futilely sent abroad; with this advantage of explanation already accomplished, he presented the thirteen billion figure which statistical reports showed. Roosevelt's assertion that "Immediately people will rush into print or run to the microphone to tell you that my arithmetic is all wrong," was humorously apt since the audience could not have been unaware of Smith's opportunity in
his address which was to follow Roosevelt's immediately on the air.\footnote{104} Its humor arose from the suggestion of the power in this "challenge technique" lay in its fortification of the audience against such refutation and in the implied trust of their good sense. H. A. Overstreet declared, "Challenge...is powerful as an attention-arousing technique." (Influencing Human Behavior, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc, New York, 1925, p. 22) Charles W. Hurd supports the idea that "Many persons who heard the speech received a distinct impression when the President said some persons might 'run to the microphone' to refute his deficit figures, that he was trying to discount a possible reply by Alfred E. Smith, who was scheduled to speak by radio later from New York." New York Times, October 2, 1936.

the hurried attempt at answer, a subtly derogatory assessment of his opponent's lack of dignity in contrast to his own jaunty self-possession.\footnote{105} Roosevelt's analogy

\footnote{105}Strong ethical appeal arises from such a contrast, particularly when one element is already highly esteemed and when the suggestion is subtly made. Charles W. Hurd pointed out that his tone in this Forbes Field address was "viewed as patronizing toward his opposition." Ibid.

of a statement of government liabilities without one of government assets to similar treatment of a bank's condition was effective through its clear relation to the daily life of the listeners.\footnote{106} He repeated the vivid example brought the idea within the experience of the ordinary person. "The strength of a suggestion will be determined in part by the degree of internal
resistance it encounters. That suggestion will be most effective which can call to its aid or appropriate the dynamic force of some other impulse that is already active or latent..." H. L. Hollingworth, op. cit., p. 142.

opening phrase in another sentence: "That is technically and morally just as correct, as telling you...that none of your bank deposits or insurance policies are any good." Thus he reminded them of Knox's claim, a clever sally because it arose so neatly out of the previous easily-accepted illustration, because it would receive the impact of emotion called out on the former, and because it stimulated the feeling of direct challenge to Knox, who was known to be at that moment only four blocks away. 107

107Kermit McFarland reported, "When he turned his speaking talent for one brief paragraph on Colonel Frank Knox, the Republican vice-presidential nominee who shortly before spoke a quarter-mile away, the audience caught the idea and set up another din. Mr. Roosevelt smiled his most hilarious smile at the response he won for that paragraph." Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936.

Strong comparison between his eight billion dollar increase in three years with the twenty-five billion increase in a two year war period further reduced the apparent size of his expenditure. 108 Again

108In this analogy Roosevelt asserts the basic comparability of the elements in his declaration that
the economic struggle of 1933 in America was a war, as he stated in other addresses, for example his acceptance speech of June 29, 1936. The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 232.

Roosevelt, in belligerent tone, asked the audience to demonstrate its enthusiasm with his leading question, "Don't you believe that the saving of America has been cheap at that price?" His audience, heavily of mining population, were willing to respond to the question on Roosevelt's terms, but it is indeed likely that his opponents chafed at the suggestions lying in the words "saving of America" and "cheap." 109

109 Genung explained how this overstatement might be received by an audience. "Public spoken discourse...obeys the tendency...in pitching its expression in a more intense key, using words charged with a more absolute or extreme significance than can be brought strictly to book. This excess of vividness exactly corrects itself in the occasion and object; so that when the natural shrinkage is allowed for, the overstatement is not an over effect." (Op. cit., p. 122.) This "natural shrinkage" would not, however, take place in the minds of Roosevelt's antagonists nor in the thoughts of those who read but did not hear the speech, and it would occur less in the thoughts of those who heard but did not see the speaker in the suggestible crowd-situation.

A clear-cut, forceful example of "the saving of America" was that of the passage of a full year without a bank failure, news which he had received by telegram on the train to Pittsburgh and had announced
in a rear-platform talk at Fairmont, West Virginia. The intimate audience relationship of his "And, incidentally, my friends," and the natural ring of his "the end of a whole year" added power to the declaration; applause broke in before he had declared the event a record of "not twelve long years, but fifty-five years," and he restrained the audience with these words, "But wait, wait..." until he had brought the statement to its climax. He recognized the national audience by declaring that he wanted to celebrate this anniversary with the group present and with "the American people." Even his opponents could not deny the good news, and the idea of general rejoicing had strong motivative appeal; however, his foes would have denied strongly his use of the fact as proof of the success of his program.

Roosevelt's comparison between Pittsburgh's scoreboard of 1932 and 1936 was another specific proof that the Democratic "team" had managed well; his descriptive eloquence and his characterization of the

\[110\] The contrast of lifelessness with the bustle, the appeal to sight and sound, the opposition of "idleness and hunger" to "the roaring song of industry"—this concentration of vivid elements in a single descriptive passage held much motivative appeal through its reconstruction of past experience for the miners and also much ethical appeal through its sheer stylistic excellence.
Roosevelt's mistake in presenting his script in this graphic paragraph was covered by forming an appositive. He omitted the words "this greatest" and thus first read, "mile after mile of mill..." He simply added "the greatest mill" and proceeded. About five minutes earlier in the address he had said "from the background" rather than "from the backbone"; here also he put the desired word in through the appositional form. The audience probably did not notice these "bumbles," as Roosevelt was wont to call them, but his continuation of the idea without breaking the sentence structure proves his facility with language.

Roosevelt's final step in defense of the eight billion increase in indebtedness took the form of refutation of the Republican charge, as in Landon's acceptance address on July 23, 1936, that the debt would have to be paid by the people's savings and by their children. Reducing the power of the argument first by labeling it as "this foolish fear," he pointed to the increase of national income and the decrease of deficits as having outrun expectations, centering the audience's attention by colloquial words of express command—"One word more: They're simple figures; keep them in the front of your heads"—upon the figures showing the
unanticipated rise in income.\footnote{113}{Roosevelt's figures are less, in each case, than those presented in the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1940, (p. 314). Roosevelt referred to national income in 1932 as 38 billion, in 1935 as 53, and estimated a rise to a total over 60 billion in 1936; the Abstract gave these data: 40 billion; over 55 billion; sixty-five billion.} His expression of

confidence, based upon these valid statistics, that "within a year or two" these governmental receipts without any additional taxes would be sufficient to "balance the budget" was received with applause by an audience too emotionally lifted to weigh this prediction in the light of former prophecies.\footnote{114}{In Roosevelt's address on the budget at Pittsburgh four years before he had condemned the Republican administration for its extravagance in the routine expenditures of government, had localized the cause of the fiscal collapse in 1929 and 1930 as the "economic heresies" of 1928, they had not balanced the budget. He declared that he would institute a program of economy, would hope to secure a new source of revenue in a beer tax, would aim at balancing the budget with the reservation that need on the part of the people might call for expenditures that would keep the budget out of balance. (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. I, pp. 795-810.) His prediction of balancing the budget was still hinged upon that question of extra expenditures— in 1936 for the unemployed and for farm families in the drought areas. Thus, the argument that no new taxation would be needed and that the budget would be balanced had little validity, especially in the minds of the Republicans who recalled that twice within little more than a year the President had}
asked for large tax increases shortly after declaring that no increases were planned. *New York Herald Tribune*, August 15, 1936.

Thus, the President had argued that the amount of expenditure was justified in that assets offset much of the total, that this usage was more productive than the sending of billions overseas or spending billions in warfare, that the plan would not be paid out of the savings of people or the earnings of their children but out of increased national income. He did not answer the question of economy in routine governmental expenditure which had been thrust at him both by his own speech of the previous campaign and repeatedly by Republican speakers in the 1936 campaign. This omission probably assumed more importance to his opponents who read the newspaper version or heard the address by radio than to his adherents attending the Pittsburgh address.

One terse sentence of strong words, carefully articulated in structure, uttered with serious impressiveness in force, prolongation and pause, drew the address to its conclusion. Its power lay in its abrupt shift from the level of discussion of the previous argument to a high level of dedication to American ideals; its power lay also in its swift juxtaposition of ideas presented in the address—solvency, and the enormity of
the crisis being successfully passed—with denial of
the sacrifice of democracy or ideals, an issue more
clearly touched in the Syracuse address of two evenings
before.

The oral quality of the sentence is striking:

The government of this great Nation, solvent,
sound in credit, is coming through a crisis
as grave as war—coming through without having
sacrificed American democracy or the ideals
of American life.

The impromptu repetition of "coming through" with pro-
longed, powerful utterance somewhat indicative of the
vigorous but successful effort involved provided strong
framework for the statement of values not sacrificed.

Rapid utterance of the final phrase permitted the last
strong emphasis to remain on "democracy" and "ideals"
words of high pathetic appeal, but allowed the speaker
the advantage of the sudden surprise ending.115

---

115 The sense of movement, of progress toward a
goal, is the strongest element in this closing sentence.
His devotion to movement was an oft-noted characteris-
tic. Emil Ludwig declared, "He loves the word 'action'
and his tone, when he speaks of it, is like that of the
singer speaking of voice, the sculptor speaking of
stone...it is the focal word of his life." (op. cit.,
p. 297.) Genung's explanation of a writer's style seems
adaptable to that of a speaker also: "Each writer imparts
something of his own personality, the coloring of his
spirit or his moods, to what he writes; so that the
vigor of his will, the earnestness of his convictions,
the grace of his fancies live again in a manner of expression that would be natural to no one else. This manner of expression moves in its individual lines of thought, begets its individual vocabulary and mould of sentence, and is in fact the incommunicable element of style." (op. cit., p. 2) It is thus easy to understand that Roosevelt's style would contain a strong "kinetic" element. Overstreet has pointed out that this "kinetic requirement" is perhaps the most fundamental of requirements for capturing and holding attention. "It is movement towards. It carries us along—to something." op. cit., pp. 12-13.

Summary and Interpretation

Roosevelt presented a vigorous address on what has usually been considered a dull, uninteresting subject before an enthusiastic crowd of more than sixty thousand at Forbes Field in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on October 1, 1936. Because the unusually strong Democratic registration in Pennsylvania had raised the possibility of that party securing the electoral votes of this traditionally Republican state, Roosevelt's speaking plans were rearranged to include an address at this key city. The dramatic interest in this occasion was particularly strong, for only four blocks away Knox was speaking at a Republican rally and Al Smith was to address the Independent Coalition of American Women in New York and the nation by air at the close of the President's address.

Republican condemnation of Roosevelt's administration
for expenditures, debt increases, tax increases, and failure to balance the budget had been strong at all times; however, challenge on this issue had become compelling in mid-September when Knox made the startling claim that neither insurance policies nor savings accounts were safe under the Roosevelt administration. Soothing statements to the press from bank and insurance company executives who had conferred with the President had not eliminated the effect of the announcement; the money and credit issue had to be met.

Roosevelt had made a speech on the budget at Forbes Field during his campaign in 1932; a speech there in 1936, treating the same subject, would allow him to emphasize the change in the situation during those four years and to present his explanation of the government's expenditures before a demonstratively friendly audience.

Thus Roosevelt travelled to an organized labor stronghold in potentially Democratic territory to make his stand on the government's budget.

**Ideas and logical proofs**

Roosevelt, speaking in a baseball park, based his address on the budget on a comparison between government's financial records and baseball's box scores.
Inherent in this comparison lay two beliefs: that government finance could be clearly explained and understood; that these dealings should be presented for the members of the "teams" to see.

From these premises Roosevelt argued that his administration's decision to borrow funds for the purpose of alleviating the disastrous results of the depression, rather than increasing taxation or neglecting the people's need, had been wise. Further he contended that the amount borrowed was justified.

In general, his argument on the first of these two major contentions was valid and vigorously pursued. By ignoring the possibility of reduction of administrative costs of government, however, he opened this address to strong attack by comparison with his Pittsburgh address of 1932, when he had condemned extravagance in costs of conducting government. In explanation of his rejection of a let-alone policy, Roosevelt presented four reasons which had compelled his decision, specifying vividly in each what the results of adopting a let-alone policy would have been. These arguments regarding further concentration of property ownership, the government's responsibility to prevent starvation, the inability of local communities and private business to meet the needs,
were drawn from the people's own experiences and were thus well-grounded. Roosevelt argued that, because of this impossibility of using other methods, the Federal government had accepted the final responsibility of meeting the needs, a basic premise which Hoover had refused to accept, but which was in line with social trends in the United States and the world in 1936. That these actions to raise purchasing power and national income had been causative factors in recovery, Roosevelt asserted here as elsewhere in the campaign; his opponents' charge that the credit of having brought recovery was not his was not answered until the Chicago address on October 14.

Having thus developed his argument that the governmental policy of borrowing had been wisely adopted, he dealt with the amount of debt increase during his administration. This was the crux of his address. He made the inescapable total seem less by several more or less accurate methods. Roosevelt held that the total to be considered should not include the amount of assets outstanding, an acceptable contention. He argued further that the net increase, small in relation to foreign loans (a comparison faulty through use of non-similar entities) and to war expenditures, had been justified by the resulting recovery. His conclusion—that
increased national income would cover the repayment without additional taxation and thus allow the balancing of the budget—pleased his Forbes Field audience, but it is probable that it failed to convince many in his radio audience who recalled his previous similar promises.

The President had fulfilled the assurance to his audience that he would give them the "story" of the budget in "plain, scoreboard arithmetic."

Ethical proofs

Without doubt the strongest ethical proof in this address was the President's reputation as the friend of labor; he made no reference to his activities on behalf of this group and needed to make none. The presentation of the award from the miners at the close of his address attested the power of his standing in their regard.

The interest of the audience in the comparison of governmental expenditures with baseball scores greatly increased their good will toward the speaker. His vivid picturization of the results which would have occurred had he not rejected the advice to employ a let-alone policy undoubtedly recalled personal experiences to his listeners, experiences which, except for the speaker,
would have lengthened and worsened. Such a consideration increased the stature of the President in the eyes of those who allowed him his claim of having brought recovery.

**Pathetic proofs**

Roosevelt's basic premises—that government finance could and should be made understandable to the people—held strong motivative appeal in their recognition of the value and common-sense of the citizen. Direct references to the judgment of the audience on phases of argument were cogent uses of pathetic appeal.

Roosevelt's pride in the facts he presented was evidenced before the people and afforded them strong motivation to react in the same fashion. His stirring emphasis upon the need for spending American dollars for American benefit struck at the basic drive for self-preservation.

The President's words and manner of utterance showed, throughout the address, that he felt that the audience was with him in his analysis; in the Worcester speech on the subject of taxation, he showed much less confidence in the support of his audience. The manifestation of trust in the understanding and acceptance of this audience afforded deep pathetic appeal.
Arrangement

This address to the enthusiastic miner audience gained power from its unity, for it centered upon two basic, well-differentiated parts. Particularly valuable was the apportionment of time. Logically, Roosevelt would not have needed to spend one half of his time on the first argument, for he could have demonstrated that borrowing was the answer to the government's need in much shorter space. But, before a group who had achieved great gains during his administration, Roosevelt found it effective to make vivid the earlier conditions and to suggest the plight to which the people would have come had his government failed to borrow funds. Within the second argument this adjustment of length of development to audience reaction was also clearly demonstrated, for Roosevelt spoke of the bonus, a well known benefit, in two short sentences, whereas he explained the alleged unfairness of foreign loans for two paragraphs.

Roosevelt's declaration of the possibility of repayment of the debt through increased national income was effectively placed at the close of his second major argument, and allowed him to conclude the address with the prediction of balancing the budget.

The transitional element between the major
arguments was particularly clear, for Roosevelt declared, "All right, my friends, let's look at the cost."

Roosevelt's arrangement, therefore, added to the power of the address particularly through its ordering of the parts and its apportionment of time among them.

Language

Consonant with the vigor of the baseball terminology in this speech was the vividness of colloquial expressions, familiar comparisons, and direct questions at the conclusion of ideas. In this address, as in no other except the one in Madison Square Garden, also a rally, did he check the dynamic interplay of speaker-stimulus and audience-response, that he had created, in order to bring to his planned climax the idea which his listeners were interrupting with applause.

Delivery

This address was a strong political effort, delivered with an apparent confidence in arguments presented and in the audience's favorable reception of them.

Much of the strength of this speech lay in Roosevelt's forceful and direct utterance of statements
and questions at the ends of sections of his argument. Variation of voice, particularly in the aspect of loudness, assisted in bringing out the vivid contrast between Republican and Democratic policies. His positive fall of pitch on summary statements, combined with conversational tones on the introduction of new ideas, suggested to his auditors a successful progression of ideas.

The contrast between Roosevelt's delivery of this address and of his acceptance speech at Philadelphia three months before was indeed great. Yet on both occasions he spoke to immense throngs of favorable listeners on huge outdoor playing fields. In Philadelphia he came to the crowd as a great President, rededicating himself to important issues for their welfare, and he spoke with uplifted oratory. In Pittsburgh he addressed mining populations as their friendly leader explaining to them in terms that they could understand how he had spent the public money for their good, and he delivered a vigorous, direct, informal analysis of the problem.

Thus, Roosevelt, in his message on the budget, had put a complex, controversial subject within the grasp of his industrial audience in Forbes Field and his listeners elsewhere by his clear use of baseball terms, by his energetic directness of language, and by his
simplified statement of the totals involved. The powerful effect of this address was shown not only by the enthusiastic response of his immediate, favorable audience but by the direct replies made by his opponents in the weeks following. Roosevelt had gratified the mining population of Pennsylvania by his appearance in their midst and by his simple, assured explanation, and had given the nation evidence that the financial issue was to be vigorously dealt with in the campaign.

Reactions to the speech

Those near the President felt that his Pittsburgh address was effective, although the conditions favor-

Charles W. Hurd reported that members of the President's party accompanying him on the train journey continued to speak enthusiastically of the "show" put on in Pittsburgh in his honor and still described it as "dramatic and important" when compared with Roosevelt's enthusiastic reception the following day in metropolitan New York. (New York Times, October 3, 1936) Also White House attaches announced that the President had received "considerable evidence of favorable reaction to his recent speeches in West Virginia, Pennsylvania and New York." Ibid., October 4, 1936.

able to success in this address made it "difficult, if not impossible, to define accurately the genuine public
reaction."\textsuperscript{118} Pointing out that the assurance of Roose-

\textsuperscript{118}Ibid.

velt's associates had "changed perceptibly within the last week," Paul Mallon analyzed the attitude as resulting from "carefully planned organization maneuvers" rather than from speeches made.\textsuperscript{119} Kermit McFarland declared,

\textsuperscript{119}Washington Star, October 8, 1936.

"President Roosevelt was the oldtime campaigner last night."\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{120}Pittsburgh Press, October 2, 1936.

Labelling the address as a "fighting speech," Charles W. Hurd pointed out that the President's "militant advocacy of the creation of a deficit under the circumstances in which he came into office" was interpreted in large part as an answer to charges made by Colonel Knox.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{121}New York Times, October 2, 1936.

Knox had claimed, at the West Virginia State Republican Convention on August 13, 1936, that the New Deal had brought increased debt and taxes, had made likely a rise in cost of living through inflation, and yet had professed a love for the common people; he had declared, "On this one issue of economy in government, of sanity in expenditures, of wisdom in budget making,
the Republican party can win the battle." Vital Speeches, 2: 746-749, September 1, 1936, "The Most Expensive Amateur Hour in History."

The President certainly stirred a hornet's nest by his speech at Pittsburgh, for columnists and speakers immediately took up his contentions. Franklyn Waltman pointed out that the President ought to avoid Forbes Field as a place for major political addresses; he declared that Roosevelt's enemies wouldn't let him forget his speech of the previous campaign there and that what he said there in the second address had already begun to plague him.\footnote{Washington Post, October 6, 1936.} Both Landon and Hoover dedicated a full speech to answering this address. Both challenged the President's bookkeeping; Landon pointed to the eleven million of the unemployed and the twenty million on relief rolls as evidence that the President had not balanced the budget of the people;\footnote{He pointed out, also, that Roosevelt had not kept his 1932 promise to reduce spending; he argued that Roosevelt's plan of paying the debt out of increased national income was mortgaging the "future income of every family." New York Times, October 10, 1936.} Hoover denied Roosevelt the credit for recovery.\footnote{His address was a point by point attack on}
Roosevelt's use of figures, attempting to show misleading interpretations. He declared, "If such an unmoral scoreboard had been put before any baseball game in the country the manager would be driven off the field." Vital Speeches, 2: 49-53, November 1, 1936, "Book, Chapter and Verse."

that the past experience of the people would have them guessing whether the President's current prediction of balancing the budget was another example of "jolllying" the country along, or one of poor prediction.\footnote{Washington Post, October 6, 1936.}

W. Davis, Democratic presidential candidate in 1924, speaking over the National Broadcasting Company's network on October 20, 1936, challenged whether spreading the habit of government support of the individual was a really humanitarian use of public money, and urged the Democrats to reject Roosevelt for basic Democratic ideals.\footnote{Vital Speeches, 2: 34-37, "Principles."}

These attacks prove nothing more clearly than the truth that specific issues were not the crux of the 1936 campaign, but rather that the whole concept of government in its relation to people was the true problem under consideration.

The general effectiveness of the President
Charles W. Hurd contrasted the President's effectiveness in the two campaigns: "The Roosevelt of 1936 is a little stouter, visibly older and bolder than the Roosevelt of 1932. But he retains the same ability to find precisely the work or gesture for each situation that may arise, and he has a greater self-assurance than in his first campaign for the presidency four years ago."

Mr. Hurd also compared his non-political addresses with the Pittsburgh and Syracuse speeches: "Freed of restraint, too, from the necessity of speaking in general terms of his opposition, imposed by the 'non-political' label attached to his earlier speeches this year, he has found ways to make his remarks more vigorous, more militant." *New York Times*, October 4, 1936.

Concern in 1936 seemed to be felt over his physical fitness. In this address, the President met an immediate audience, already favorable to him, and directed their approval effectively to sentiments and conclusions which he had chosen.

---

127 Charles W. Hurd contrasted the President's effectiveness in the two campaigns: "The Roosevelt of 1936 is a little stouter, visibly older and bolder than the Roosevelt of 1932. But he retains the same ability to find precisely the work or gesture for each situation that may arise, and he has a greater self-assurance than in his first campaign for the presidency four years ago."

Mr. Hurd also compared his non-political addresses with the Pittsburgh and Syracuse speeches: "Freed of restraint, too, from the necessity of speaking in general terms of his opposition, imposed by the 'non-political' label attached to his earlier speeches this year, he has found ways to make his remarks more vigorous, more militant." *New York Times*, October 4, 1936.

128 Milton MacKaye pointed out that "It is significant that a public once conscious of the fact has almost forgotten that the President is a physically disabled man." *Ladies Home Journal*, 53: 12, October, 1936.
Chapter IV

THE ADDRESS AT AKSARBEN COLISEUM, OMAHA, NEBRASKA,
OCTOBER 10, 1930

The Background

Roosevelt's August trip to the drought areas had been shortened by the severity of the world crisis; however, his October "political" trip was doubled in extent after he had consulted with his political attitude analyzer, Emil Hurja. One factor in this decision may have been Landon's strong effort to win the farm belt to his candidacy, an effort which was generally believed to have improved his prospects in Nebraska, the Dakotas, Iowa, Minnesota and Wisconsin. Secretary of State Hull answered Landon's Minneapolis speech with an address in the same
city on October 9, 1936; John Winant, former Chairman of

4Hull answered directly Landon's contentions on cheddar cheese, babassu nuts and cattle; he claimed that the huge import increases were largely in products not touched by trade agreements, and declared that the farmer had been "sold out" by the Smoot-Hawleyites. Time, 28:16, October 19, 1936.

5One of the strongest contentions presented by Landon had been the danger of government manipulation of the forty-seven billion reserve. (Vital Speeches, 3:28, October, 15, 1936, "I Will Not Promise the Moon.") Winant explained that the system could be changed within the next five years when the reserve fund would not exceed four billion. New York Times, September 30, 1936.

Of the issues discussed in these speeches, the two which most agitated the farmers seem to have been relief administration and the American farmer's market.

6"So general are these two complaints throughout the farm belt that they are inescapable even to one not particularly interested in the political trends in the West." New York Times, August 2, 1936, Felix Belair, Jr.

Roosevelt, with a large party of advisers,

7The party included Secretary of Agriculture Wallace; Breckenridge Long, former Ambassador to Italy; Senators Pittman of Nevada and O'Mahoney of Wyoming; Judge Samuel Rosenman of New York. Washington Star, October 8, 1936, J. Russell Young.
began his "political" tour with a series of motor parades, Federal works inspections, rear-platform talks, and

When Roosevelt's eleven car train stopped in Dubuque, Iowa, he told the crowd: "I am out here on what I suppose some people will consider a political trip. Nevertheless, I am primarily concerned about the future of the country; we all are. I am trying to gain better first-hand information as to the needs of the country in the days to come. It will be useful to me, whether I am reelected or not." (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. 5, p. 414) This disclaimer of political intent was repeated at Oelwein, Iowa, with an added declaration of interest in farming: "And so my friends -- this is not a prepared speech -- I just want to talk to you as one neighbor to another. I don’t pretend to be a farmer; I happen to be by profession a lawyer. But I have farmed the best years of my life, up on the Hudson River and down in the State of Georgia, so I do know about some of the problems of agriculture in the United States. Every day that I go through this country I try to learn more about it; and that is going to stand me in good stead whether or not I go back to the White House for the next four years. And, incidentally, I get a tremendous kick out of it. It is good to see you all." Ibid., pp. 415-16.

political and farm conferences. In his address at St.

A political meeting was held aboard the special train in St. Paul to discuss the withdrawal of Democratic candidates for Senator and Governor with the announced purpose of uniting forces for Roosevelt's election. Secretary Wallace arranged a regional farm conference at Dubuque and another at St. Paul. Washington Star, October 9, 1936.

Paul, he praised farm cooperatives and upheld reciprocal trade treaties. As he proceeded to Nebraska, he

The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D.

continued to answer pertinent issues in rear-platform
remarks;\(^1\) once inside the State he divided his time

\(^1\)At Red Oak, Iowa, he answered the charge Landon had
made at Des Moines, that the Roosevelt agricultural policy,
like an automobile, changed its model every year. (Vital
Speeches, 2:821, October 1, 1936, "A Workable Farm Program")
He declared, "Well, isn't the automobile better than it was
twenty years ago?" (The Public Papers and Addresses of
Pacific Junction, Iowa, to a telegram which he had received
about people telling others that his reelection would mean
payment of the national debt by a tax on homes and farms,
and remarked that there were still some people who didn't
know that real estate taxes go only for local and State
purposes. Ibid.

between public appearances\(^1^2\) and conferences with political

\(^1^2\)At noon Roosevelt spoke before 10,000 Nebraskans in
Lincoln (Time, 28:15, October 19, 1936), declaring his con­
fidence in their verdict on November third because "the
American people know how to separate the wheat from the
chaff." (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D.
Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 430) He did not mention Norris, who
had joined the Presidential party as soon as the train had
crossed into Nebraska, but the crowd called loudly for him
after Roosevelt had finished. Norris said: "My friends,
I thank you for this greeting. I realize, as you realize,
that all this enthusiasm is for your great President. I'm
glad to have, with you, a share in honoring him who, I
think, has done more for ordinary men than anyone who has
occupied the White House for the past twelve years." New
York Times, October 11, 1936.

leaders "aimed at unifying Democratic leadership in the
State and overcoming differences caused by his espousal of
the candidacy of Senator Norris.\footnote{Ibid., Charles W. Hurd.}

\textbf{The Audience}

A crowd of 12,000 packed the Aksarben Coliseum to capacity; other thousands gathered outside and heard the address through amplifiers.\footnote{New York Times, October 11, 1936, Charles W. Hurd.} These thousands had gathered from the farm areas of Nebraska and Iowa to hear the President. Radio carried Roosevelt's words to the nation.

Was this farm audience favorable to Roosevelt? It must be remembered that eighty per cent of the farmers of Nebraska were reported by officials as having agreed to cooperate in the Federal conservation program.\footnote{Ibid., September 1, 1936, Charles W. Hurd.} Also the special drought committee of the Department of Agriculture had added, only two months before, thirty-four counties in Nebraska and Missouri to its list of emergency drought counties.\footnote{Ibid., August 2, 1936.} However, the Nebraska farmers had not fully
decided their allegiance, as was illustrated by the fact that their venerated Republican Senator, George W. Norris, whose liberal tendencies had made him a consistent New Dealer, was having the most difficult campaign of his long career.17

17 *Time*, 28:18, October 19, 1936. Norris had represented his State for 10 years in the House and 24 in the Senate.

An audience in the Midwest has much less opportunity than a city audience to be present at the political gatherings addressed by national leaders; hence, both attendance and enthusiasm may well have been the result of factors other than that of advocacy of Roosevelt's re-election.18 In addition to past help and future promises

18 Note the view of an editorial writer who "felt obliged to differ with him": "Omaha welcomes Mr. Roosevelt ... as a candidate. It is a pleasure to know the engaging charm of his personality, to thrill to the magic of his voice. We appreciate the best, and we know that as a candidate Franklin Roosevelt has not alone no superiors but no equal. He is a master of the art of popular appeal, and of practical politics, such as this Nation has seldom if ever known. When he comes to ask for four more years of the presidency we are keenly aware his cause will be presented with a persuasive eloquence, a skill of rhetoric, such as no other living man could equal. It is a superb artist as well as a popular and powerful leader who comes to us, and we appreciate the privilege of seeing and hearing him." *Omaha Evening World-Herald*, October 10, 1936.
from the administration's farm program, in addition to
the appeal of popularity and power to those in more routine
stations of life, there was likely an eagerness to give
the President a splendid reception. The influence of
Farley's slighting reference to Landon's position\(^\text{19}\) may

\[^{19}\text{Farley had said in his address at the Michigan Demo-
ocratic State Convention of May 20, 1936, relative to Lan-
don's candidacy for the Republicans, "I would be inclined
to believe it was because he was elected Governor of a
typical prairie State that has usually been Republican,
and that the duPont Liberty League crowd is less afraid
of him than it is of more widely known and more experi-
cenced statesmen who have been mentioned in connection with
the Republican nomination." Vital Speeches, 2:551, June 1,
1936, "The New Deal and its Critics."}\]

well have put Nebraska upon its mettle in the quality of
Roosevelt's reception.\(^\text{20}\) Thus, Roosevelt's audience in

\[^{20}\text{Farley explained that the President wrote him a
memo, suggesting the further avoidance of a term which
might reflect upon the fair name of Kansas. (James A.
Farley, Behind the Ballots, Harcourt, Brace and Co., N. Y.,
1938, p. 306). John Lambert has pointed out that Farley
was denied a conspicuous place in rallies addressed by
the President because of his "egregious blunder." Washing-
ton Herald, October 12, 1936. Note the desire for ap-
preciation in the words of the editorial writer: "Today
is Franklin Roosevelt's day in Omaha. We shall bask in
the sunshine of his debonair gaiety and courage. The keys
of the city are his, the plaudits of its people and their
neighbors. We hope the president of the United States
will as thoroughly enjoy his visit as we of this typical
prairie state enjoy his coming." Omaha Evening World-
Herald, October 10, 1936.}\]
Aksarben Coliseum on October 10, 1936, were united in the desire to do him honor and enjoy his presence.

The Immediate Setting of the Speech

Two factors in the immediate setting were important in the attitudes of the audience: one, the pressure of the crowd; two, the presence of noted figures on the platform.

The effect of a closely-packed auditorium was enhanced by the press of the thousands outside, desiring but denied admittance yet provided with the opportunity of hearing by the loud-speaker arrangements. This situation would be far more operative upon the emotions and attitudes of a country audience, unused to the pressure of numbers in their daily lives, than upon one whose lives were spent moving among thousands of their fellow-beings. The sense of general excitement which pervaded Aksarben Coliseum that evening was pointed out by Mrs. Gilbert M. Hitchcock, widow of Nebraska's Senator, who was present on the platform.

Mrs. Hitchcock asserted, in a letter to the writer
on May 24, 1948, that she remembered little of the details of the evening except "the general excitement and a hall packed full."

In addition to Mrs. Hitchcock, who had been brought from Washington with the Presidential party to show her loyalty to Roosevelt, the audience saw their

"My husband's paper, the Omaha World-Herald, had come out against Roosevelt soon after my husband's death. I was still for him and sent such a message -- this being the reason I was taken along -- just my presence in the party showing that 'Mrs. Hitchcock' was still for Roosevelt."

Republican liberal statesman accorded a position on the platform with the Presidential candidate of the opposing party. This recognition of integrity and achievement

Nebraska's sentiment toward her veteran statesman was shown by the 1936 nominations. Norris had declared, in the summer of 1935, his desire to retire. The Republicans then gave the nomination to Simmons. The Democrats begged Norris to accept their nomination; Terry Carpenter, supported by Townsendites, Coughlinites, Share-our-Wealthers, obtained the Democratic primary votes but was not endorsed by the Democratic State Convention. Then 40,000 citizens nominated Norris by petition, and the Democrats "swung in behind him." Time, 28:18, October 19, 1936.

rather than partisanship doubtless gratified the pride of Nebraskans. Also on the platform sat Senator Burke and Boss Mullen, Nebraskans whose recognition by the

It was considered necessary to win the support of
Nebraska's Mullen-Burke machine to secure the reelection of Senator Norris. However, it was clearly remembered that "Senator Burke had mentioned distaste for some New Deal measures when resigning from the National Committee, that President Roosevelt had forced State Democratic Boss Arthur Mullen off the National Committee two years ago because of his lobbying activities." Ibid., p. 19.

Presidential campaign party might not have been expected. Doubtless the national figures in the President's entourage -- Secretary Wallace, Senators Pittman and O'Mahoney, Mrs. Roosevelt -- added to the excitement of the occasion.

Thus, the sense of being part of a great throng assembled to hear "the President" and of having important figures from the Capital of the country present on Omaha's own platform was a strong factor in the audience's preparatory attitude toward Roosevelt's address.

The radio audience heard the National Broadcasting Company's announcer say:

Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. The following program is presented under the sponsorship of the Democratic National Committee. The President of the United States stands before 20,000 people in Aksarben Coliseum in Omaha, Nebraska, 26.

Doubtless the announcer's figure differed from the press report quoted heretofore, because it included the thousands actually outside the building.

and before the N.B.C. microphone which will carry his voice to a waiting nation.

To Mrs. Hitchcock, widow of the late Senator from Nebraska, goes the distinction of introducing the
President. We present Mrs. Hitchcock.

The cheers of the audience made the words of Mrs. Hitchcock difficult for both immediate and radio audience to hear:

I have -- I have -- I have -- I have the very great honor to present to you the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. (27)

Mrs. Hitchcock stated, in a letter of May 24, 1948, to the writer, that her introduction of the President "came about very unexpectedly, and when about two hours before reaching Omaha (shortly before time for the speech) the President sent word he would like me to introduce him, I was surprised, had not expected to take any part whatsoever, and frankly scared as I had never done anything of the sort before -- or since -- in my life.... It was a last minute arrangement to have me introduce him and I said only a few words, and of course as he stood, his back was toward me."

At the close of the address the radio audience heard the ovation given the President by his enthusiastic audience and the words of the announcer:

Ladies and Gentlemen, you have heard the President of the United States in an address sponsored by the Democratic National Committee and delivered before a great and enthusiastic audience of Democrats gathered in the Aksarben Coliseum at Omaha, Nebraska. The President's visible audience consisted of twenty thousand Nebraskans and their neighbors from Iowa. He was introduced by Mrs. Gilbert M. Hitchcock, widow of the late Democratic United States Senator from Nebraska, and now with the cheering of this big friendly audience still ringing in his ears the President turns away from the microphone and soon will make
his way out of the crowded Coliseum and back to his train. 28

The words of the announcer and of Mrs. Hitchcock were taken from the recording of the address made from its master records for the writer by the National Broadcasting Company.

The President's own attitude and preparation toward the address and the occasion were important. His experience at Lincoln earlier in the day may well have satisfied him of the gratifyingly enthusiastic reception Nebraskans were ready to accord him. 29 On the other hand, 29

In a region where occupation and basic interests were similar over wide areas, there was less likelihood of a differentiated response from one community to another than in a region of widely differentiated occupations and interests, for example, of mingled rural and urban areas. Although Omaha had a population of over 200,000 in 1940 and Lincoln had over 80,000, yet no other city in the state reached the stature of 20,000 people. And these two larger concentrations of population were still so closely tied up with the fortunes and welfare of the surrounding rural areas as to be generally rural in flavor.

he was doubtless impressed with the serious nature of the campaign for Norris's reelection. Charles W. Hurd pointed out that the President had done some work on outlining speeches on both social security and agriculture before leaving Washington. 30 That the President made no rear-

30 New York Herald Tribune, October 5, 1936.
platform talks until his train reached Iowa on the outward swing but at many points in Illinois, Michigan and Ohio on the homeward journey would support the theory that the President was giving himself time on the train to complete his scheduled campaign addresses.  

31 "Material for speeches which the President makes on trips is gathered in advance for him. On the train he dictates to his secretaries, who submit typed versions to him which he changes two or three times. Finally the speeches are sent to be mimeographed in the drawing room of the train's work car!" New York Times, October 4, 1936.  

(within two hours of reaching Omaha) of having himself introduced by Mrs. G. M. Hitchcock, widow of Nebraska's late Democratic Senator, may have been a deliberate bow to the party organization of the state, a gesture felt necessary after his day of conference with Nebraskan leaders who opposed his support of the Republican Senator Norris. Doubtless the President was exhilarated by the political adjustments in which he was taking a dynamic part;  

32 Robert S. Allen pointed out early in Roosevelt's first year in the presidency: "Of all the qualities that Mr. Roosevelt brings to the Presidency his competence in the art of practical politics is one of his most useful. Instinctively and intuitively he is a good politician." Allen also spoke of his "agility and adroitness" in playing politics. The American Mercury, 28:19, January, 1933, "The Man."
it is likely that he appreciated the importance of the occasion in its wider aspects.

The President's salutation to the official representatives of Nebraska\(^33\) was followed by "you, my friends of Nebraska and neighboring states," a greeting of intimate inclusiveness.

The power of reference to his earlier visit as their President interested in their welfare was increased by emphasis that he was glad to be back again now, showing his genuine pleasure in his visits.\(^34\) Even representative

\(^33\)"Mrs. Hitchcock, Governor Cochran, Mr. Mayor." Governor Cochran had been one of the six state executives to take part in the NBC broadcast in late July, 1936, with the purpose of answering Landon's acceptance address; however, the Governor had hardly mentioned the New Deal thus far in his campaign for reelection. The Mayor was Mr. Dan B. Butler.

\(^34\)"He learned to love people, and they returned it. Seldom has a man been so beloved within his own generation. ... Roosevelt's ways of associating himself with many and different kinds of people, which began to show themselves even before he was Governor, endeared him to the common people as they came to know him, and made the common people entirely comprehensible to him.... He did not and could not know them all individually, but he thought of them individually. He thought of them in family groups." Frances Perkins, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 5, 71.
Roosevelt critics did not deny his sincerity. Also the

Mark Sullivan agreed with Dorothy Thompson's characterization of Roosevelt as a "barometer" to outside conditions, and added, "Accompanying this trait is an immense capacity for sincerity about the thing he happens to wish to believe at the time." New York Herald Tribune, October 20, 1936. Franklyn Waltman, pointing to the broken pledges, yet admitted, "And yet I think Mr. Roosevelt is sincere at any given time." Washington Post, October 22, 1936.

direct compliment to Omaha for its "marvelous" Coliseum and the appreciation of the "greetings" of the people -- expressions common to visiting speakers -- spoken by the President himself held motivative appeal.

Norris should be returned to the Senate

Roosevelt's identification with the Norris candidacy comprised several steps: (1) enlargement of his

The logical pattern of the address is as follows:
I. Norris should be returned to the Senate.
II. The farmers' problem is of national importance.
   A. The farmers' plight in 1932 was desperate.
      1. Income had been reduced by unsalable surpluses resulting from the World War.
      2. Republican policies had brought an attitude of defeatism.
         a. Farm Board had increased surpluses.
         b. Smoot-Hawley tariff had cut off foreign markets.
   B. The Democrats have convictions in meeting the problem.
      1. Agriculture is a national problem.
      2. A sound farm policy must be run by farmers.
   C. The Democrats have brought recovery to agriculture.
1. They have raised the farmers' net income.
2. They have reduced debts and danger of foreclosure on homes and farms.
3. They have regained some foreign markets.
4. They have increased the purchasing power of consumers.
5. They have started a program to prevent the waste of resources.
6. They have brought the advantages of electricity, roads and rural schools to farm families.
7. They have brought direct relief to drought areas.

D. The Republicans do not offer a good plan for agriculture.
1. They suggest return to the "free competition" of 1932.
2. They advocate tariff-equivalent payments, which would bring further surpluses.
3. They would abandon the reciprocal trade treaty for the Smoot-Hawley tariff.
4. They would spend from 1 1/2 to 2 billion dollars for this destructive plan.

E. The Republicans should not take hold of the program again.
1. They can't carry out both their farm program and their promise of reduction of expenditures.
2. They did nothing about the problem before.

F. The Democratic program is desirable.
1. A changing agricultural policy means an improved one.
2. It includes a program of soil conservation.
3. It attacks the evil of farm tenancy.
4. It proposes crop insurance.

III. The Democrats plan for an "abundant" farm life to preserve this source of national strength.
it unique; (4) solicitation of their support; (5) praise of such support. This is the pattern he frequently used for his full addresses, as for the one in which this smaller segment occurred -- showing the wide acceptance of the idea, explaining and defending it, exalting it. Thus, in the short space of a single point, Roosevelt used the same sequence, a pattern within a pattern. Here Roosevelt tied himself with an element powerfully operative in the attitudes of his audience. Of powerful motivative appeal

37 Roland M. Jones pointed out that a great many Nebraskans feel that "how the state votes on the Presidency may not be of much consequence but how it goes on the Senatorship will make a lot of difference." New York Times, October 11, 1936. One of Roosevelt's values in this association lay in the fact that Norris was now "stumping the state at a great rate, making two or three speeches per day and these more concerned with Roosevelt's candidacy than his own." That Roosevelt truly wished to assure the victory of Norris in Nebraska is shown by the number of New Deal "bigwigs" sent to help him; Secretary Wallace and Senators Barkley and Black had already come to Nebraska to help him, and Secretary Ickes as well as Senators La Follette, Wheeler, Nye and Bone were scheduled to follow the President's visit. Time, 28:18, October 19, 1936.

G. Gould Lincoln pointed out that Nebraska had its "soreheads" against Roosevelt and the New Deal, and that Landon was getting strong newspaper support, especially in Omaha. The Democrats in Nebraska who were supporting Carpenter for the Senate had made it a practice to boo Democratic speakers who spoke at rallies for Norris; Mayor Butler of Omaha had pointed out that such a demonstration at the President's address would be an affront to him and to the nation and "show Omaha up in a bad light." He declared: "The opposition to Roosevelt grows out of dislike for the manner in which large sums of
Federal money have been expended as well as dislike for the huge public debt which has been rolled up. The voters, they say, have seen favorites win favors because of political pull and men sent into the State from outside in large numbers to 'administer' relief of various kinds. Farmers have resented the manner in which their quotas were allotted to them in the AAA program. This year the State suffered terribly from the drought, and while farmers are glad to have the drought relief accorded them by the Roosevelt administration, they think that if last year they had grown more crops they would not now be so badly off." He pointed out, however, that many of the workers, many of the farmers and some of the small business men would stand for Roosevelt. Washington Star, October 9, 1936.

Roosevelt used the power here of an initial affirmative approach; Robert T. Oliver has explained that by emphasizing at the opening of a speech "the things the audience agrees upon, so that there is established a strong initial tendency to go along with the speaker -- a 'yes response'" the speaker may increase the polarization of his audience. Op. cit., p. 173.

also was his declaration that this solicitation of support for Norris was an exception to a rule; such special

38 John Hamilton, Republican National Chairman, ridiculed this claim of non-participation in a statement of October 11, 1936, in which he pointed to the withdrawal of Democratic candidates in Minnesota as another "magnificent exception," to the affectionate greeting to young Bob La Follette in Wisconsin, to the expression of personal preference in the last mayoralty campaign in New York City, to the plea to Herbert Lehman to run for re-election as Governor of New York, to the pressure on Frank Murphy to run for Governor of Michigan. New York Times, October 12, 1936. Of course, Roosevelt had admitted that he did not refrain in his home state, but he seems to have wished his participation in these other maneuvers to be passed over. Mark Sullivan made the following analysis: "In Mr. Roosevelt's case, it is a kind of boyishness which wishes a thing -- and thereupon assumes that whatever he wishes, actually is. In his Omaha speech
Mr. Roosevelt wished to make his endorsement of Senator Norris emphatic. A striking way to make it emphatic would be to say he had never done anything like it before. To say that would give pleasure to the audience, and so he said it. "New York Herald Tribune, October 20, 1936.

Norris's need for strong support may perhaps be explained by the fact that his late decision to become a candidate had allowed the Democratic nomination of Carpenter, who, however, had not been recognized by the national party organization.

treatment made Nebraska and Norris seem distinguished, a compensatory adjustment to wipe out the disparaging effect of Farley's term, "typical state." The elevation of

"Psychologists are agreed that the need for and the long practice of compensation are universal.... Huey Long's promise to make "Every man a king" and Franklin D. Roosevelt's program for a "New Deal" are but two examples of many in which persuasive speakers have won support for their proposals largely because of the need of their audiences for compensation." Robert T. Oliver, op. cit., p. 122, 133.

language which accompanied the President's high tribute was doubtless gratifying to the audience.

The President used a strongly built balanced structure, "we have had few elder statesmen who like him have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years." With no pause for the audience's response he declared simply, "He is one of the major prophets of America," a characterization with Biblical flavor; here by tone and phrasing he asked for the applause of his audience. His control of the audience's responses, evidenced throughout the tribute, is proof of the power of his speaker-audience relationship. James A. Farley declared that "The truth is that most voters respect a dignified and grammatical appeal far more than they do
clowning and ranting, provided they are convinced that the speaker has a genuine regard for their rights and political interests and is not simply putting on a show to advance himself politically." Op. cit., p. 318.

The prolonged applause which followed this praise of Norris was proof of its power with the audience -- those in the coliseum saw on the stage before them this man symbolized by their President as Nebraska's gift to the nation, desired to do him honor, esteemed the President more highly for this recognition of Norris's worth, and thought more highly of themselves as Nebraskans; those hearing the address by amplifier or radio transmission could not have been unaware of the high honor being done Nebraska.

The farmers' plight in 1932 was desperate

Comparison of the improved conditions of 1936 with the plight of 1932 took the form of claiming redemption of a pledge of help to the farmer; pointing to

41Al Smith had broadcast to the nation on October 1, 1936, that "if the President himself had made good on his promises, I would not be on this platform tonight." (Vital Speeches, 3:19, October 15, 1936, "I Am an American Before I Am a Democrat"). Landon emphasized Roosevelt's failure to live up to both financial and political pledges in his Chicago address of October 9, 1936. (New York Times, October 10, 1936). Thus, Roosevelt's claim of a redeemed pledge was implicit refutation of these frequently made campaign charges.
market reports as proof of help given was an effective method before a farmer audience who had seen the unit exchange value of farm products, in terms of other goods, rise from an index of 61 in 1932 to 98 at the time they were gathered in Aksarben Coliseum. \(^\text{42}\) Rhetorically effective though such a proof might have been, it was an example of over-simplification of a complex problem. \(^\text{43}\)

\(^\text{42}\) The Agricultural Situation, 20:1, October 1, 1936, George B. Fiske.

\(^\text{43}\) John W. Davis, Democratic Candidate for President in 1924, declared in his address on October 20, 1936, "Surely when great issues of government are at stake, great questions of right and wrong, justice or injustice in the balance, they ought not to be decided by pointing to carloadings, or stock quotations, or the up and down of bank deposits. Whether business is better today than it was yesterday, or will be better or worse tomorrow than it is today, is a poor guide for people who are called upon to decide what sort of government they want to live under both today and tomorrow and for the long days after that. If they found their government on the shifting sands of unsound principle, it will make no lasting difference whether business is good or bad." Vital Speeches, 3:37, November 1, 1936, "Principles."

Roosevelt's amplification of this claim of a pledge fulfilled gained opening force through the transitional question, "And what needed to be done?", which directed attention to the specific aspects of the problem. \(^\text{44}\)

\(^\text{44}\) Roosevelt's claim that the farm population in 1932
was the "greatest in all our history" and the farmers' income lowest for the quarter of the century can be substantiated (on the basis of 1930) from the Statistical Abstracts of the United States: 1937, p. 574, and 1925, p. 605. Rauch declared the share of the farmers in the national income to be 5 per cent (op. cit., p. 8); statistics of national and agricultural income of 1932, as presented in the Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1934, p. 263, give a per cent of less than 6. Hence, the President's figure of 7½ per cent was indeed conservative. The World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1933 (New York World Telegram, New York, 1933, p. 337) showed the rural farm population to be over thirty million in 1930, and the population of the country to be one hundred twenty-two million as of April 1, 1930 (Ibid., p. 324); hence, the President's representation of farmers as 25 per cent of the country's population was justified.

The first metaphorical restatement was particularly apt because of its suggestion of the vague, unforeseeable nature of the threat, because of the imagery of the verb, and because of its basis in a familiar setting: "The spectre of foreclosure stalked the farmer's plow." 45

"Crowds of farmers forced sheriffs to accept bids of a dollar or two at foreclosure auctions, and then turned the farms back to their original owners. At Le Mars, Iowa, on April 27, [1933], District Judge Bradley refused to promise a mob of farmers that he would sign no more foreclosures, and was dragged from his courtroom and hung by a rope until he was unconscious." Rauch, op. cit., pp. 70-71.

The second brief metaphor was well adapted to the independent, property-conscious, conservative Midwesterner who had long heard the admonition to keep off the "road to the poorhouse"; he would have been struck by its simple
forcefulness: "American agriculture was on the road to pauperism." Furthermore, the reason for the problem of additional surpluses was stated with a colloquial expression, "left holding the bag"; then the word "bag", used in its physical connotation, formed the basis of a metaphorical statement of the products left in surplus, a statement admirably suited to appeal to a group who had dealt with these products in their physical aspects. The President was correct in the reductions of exportation during these years: in 1921 we had exported over 280 million bushels of wheat (The Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1925, published 1926, p. 510), almost 130 million bushels of corn (Ibid., p. 510), and over 6 million bales of cotton (Ibid., p. 516); in 1936 we exported less than 2 million bushels of wheat (The Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1938, published 1939, p. 478), little more than one-half million bushels of corn (Ibid.), and 5½ million bales of cotton (Ibid., p. 484). Rauch (op. cit., p. 8) pointed out that foreign trade fell over 60 per cent from 1929 to 1932.

retrospective force of the word "that" which opens the terse summary sentence, "That was the farmer's plight," was intensified by its position (immediately after a graphic presentation of the problem) and by the long, significant pause which the speaker held after this opening word of the sentence.

This vividly pictured "plight" was effective basis for Roosevelt's transition into the solution
offered by the Republicans, the transition again a direct, colloquially-expressed question, "And what did Republican leadership do about it?" His concentration of attack upon the Republican "leadership" separated the responsibility from Republicans in general, a stand well suited to an audience in a state in which he was advocating lack of partisanship and well suited as a premise in his argument that a return of Republicans to office would mean a return of the same policies.

Roosevelt used disparagement of his opponents and the appeal of colloquial language to substantiate his charge of Republican failure. His opening "The best that it could offer" suggested a make-shift, unworthy project; the designation in a slighting tone as a "contraption" before the exact reference as the Farm Board used the power of colloquial disparagement and brought a burst of applause from the audience. Roosevelt's use of disparagement in his words "an all-time high for extravagant futility" brought laughter from his listeners; the juxtaposition of opposites was ludicrous in effect. As in the
preceeding argument, he followed the generalization with specific statement, gaining power through repetition of the word "surpluses". In contrast to the attack on the Roosevelt's claim that the Republican Farm Board added surpluses to those already existing can be well substantiated from its efforts in wheat and cotton. When the Grain Stabilization Corporation abandoned the market permanently in June, 1931, the Federal government was left in possession of the whole 1930-31 carry-over, only a part of which it was able to sell abroad. The Cotton Stabilization Corporation ended with a total of 3,250,000 bales in warehouses; the Farm Board lost $150,000,000 in cotton alone. Hacker, American Problems of Today, p. 126.

Farm Board by disparagement, Roosevelt used a direct, biting charge with cogent, graphic language on the Smoot-Hawley tariff: "And to finish the job, the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff robbed the farmer of his last chance for a foreign market."49

"The rates were higher ... than ever. In a large number of cases, the duties on raw materials ranged from 50 to 100 per cent greater than those in the 1922 schedules; generally the average ad valorem rate for all the schedules was 40.08 per cent as compared with 33.22 per cent in the 1922 Act." Ibid., p. 24. Rauch pointed out that exports fell 60 per cent between 1929 and 1932. Op. cit., p. 8.

Analysis of attitudes resulting from these conditions illustrated the President's belief that basic attitudes of a party were more important than specific acts. He charged that the Republicans thought that the
farmer could not be helped, that any attempt was foredoomed to failure. The first charge was overdrawn, but the latter was substantiated by the Republican double policy of attempting to stir the farmer to acreage cutting on his own behalf and of attempting to absorb surpluses by the Stabilization Corporations at the same time. Roosevelt's other charge -- that Republicans felt that the money they spent for the farmers was really wasted but they spent it regardless to smooth over the agricultural problem -- was a political interpretation based on the President's main premise that the Republicans were "finance-minded" rather than upon specific acts which they had put into effect.

Roosevelt's scorn for the Republican attitudes was shown by word and voice; he referred to the "defeatist attitude" as the fear that "any party that dared to substitute action for talk would get its political fingers burned," and to the belief that money spent on the farm problem was wasted as spending "to buy political peace." His strong retrospective "that" again introduced a summary statement by a backward look and a significant pause; the summary gained pathetic power by its use of analogy in graphic, simple terms.
The Democrats have convictions in meeting the problem

Characterizing the Republican attitudes of defeatism and of desire to suppress rather than solve the agricultural problem as "debris" which had to be cleared away, Roosevelt placed in vivid contrast the Democratic convictions which had underlain his administration's actions. The first Democratic conviction -- that the problem was national rather than merely agricultural -- was uttered quickly, giving the impression that measures which had been unsuccessful and slow before had now become active and dynamically successful. The motivative power of this expression of interrelation and the representation of agriculture as a vital part of the economic system was doubtless great upon an audience who had been allegedly regarded as inferior and needful of charity. Roosevelt climaxed this explanation of

50 This theme of interrelation was basic to Roosevelt's philosophy; his confidence and strong belief in this premise were evidenced in this address in Omaha by the force of his vocal utterance. In his acceptance address of 1932 he had said: "We are going to make the voters understand this year that this nation is not merely a nation of independence, but it is, if we are to survive, bound to be a nation of interdependence -- town and city, and North and South, East and West." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. I, pp. 655-56.

Democratic achievement with a play on words, "In other
words, the defeatist attitude has itself been defeated," uttering this statement with measured emphasis. Thus, this sentence gave the signal for applause by its tone of finality and by its emotionally-colored, yet concise, statement of truth accepted by the listeners.

The "second conviction" -- that of farmer participation in policy making -- proceeded by referring to Henry Wallace as a farmer in government and to conferences of farm leaders out of which grew the nation's program.  

George N. Peek and Hugh S. Johnson came from the Moline Plow Company of Illinois to Washington in the spring of 1935 to suggest plans for agricultural and industrial recovery. The Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and several other large farm organizations had much to do with the planning of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Rauch, op. cit., pp. 66, 68.

a policy brought out in strong contrast to Hoover's agricultural projects which Roosevelt labeled as "vote-catching schemes of politicians." This stress upon the participation of the farming class in government doubtless created strong pathetic appeal to the Midwest audience.

It is true that the Hoover administration clung tenaciously to its theory that the national government had no duty of providing relief, that such relief of human suffering should be done by private and local public agencies. Only such a theory would keep the votes of the moneyed classes who had not accepted the theory of the interrelation of classes in the economic structure.
in Aksarben Coliseum.

Implicit in the references to Republican "attitudes" but to Democratic "convictions" lay the contrast, upon which Roosevelt insisted, of Republican inaction and Democratic action. This accurate choice of words for securing the desired connotation held persuasive power.

The Democrats have brought recovery to agriculture

Roosevelt stated his administration's action in an agricultural metaphor, strikingly vivid to a farmer audience: "this Administration put its hand to the plow." Excellent partition prepared the audience to follow easily Roosevelt's recital of Democratic action. He centered the attention of the individual farm person on the assessment of his own "recovery" and, consequently, his debt of gratitude to the Democratic administration. Each "sentence" was geared through careful phraseology and vocal emphasis to win applause from an audience which felt the direct impact of the benefits listed;53 none failed of the

---

53 Each of the seven sentences had its own measure of truth as a logical argument. First: this listing of policies which raised the farmers' net annual income contained the fallacy of omitting a contributing cause, the fact that the severe drought of 1936 was lifting the total value of the agricultural products sold.
Second: that the Farm Credit Administration, by its quick action, had relieved the problem of farm foreclosures was indeed true. Rauch, op. cit., p. 103.

Third: that the reciprocal trade agreements had reopened the farmers' markets abroad was true. Exports of agricultural products had shown increases for the years 1933, 1934 and 1935 (Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1938, p. 261); however, the effect of the 1936 drought upon domestic consumption and the possibility of agricultural exportation made 1936 figures meaningless. The President's reference to reduced tariffs on agricultural products in France, Italy and Switzerland in October, 1936, was correct. French tariffs were reduced 15 per cent on manufactured articles, 17½ per cent on semi-finished goods and 20 per cent on rawstuffs. Switzerland and The Netherlands joined France in going off the Gold Standard. Mussolini decreed 40 percent reduction of the lira and sweepingly reduced Italian import duties. (Time, 28:24, October 12, 1936). Paul V. Horn summarized, "The over-all result of the trade agreements is indicated by the fact that between the two-year period 1934-35... exports to trade agreement countries increased about 63 per cent and to non-agreement countries about 32 per cent."

The President's strong expression of the old thesis that trade brings international peace brought prolonged applause from the Midwest, but was such a long-range hope with Japan adding landing parties to her invasion of China, Spanish insurgents driving on Toledo and the new German army displaying its strength (New York Times, September 21, 1936) that it had little validity at the moment.

Fourth: that government aid to business, the unemployed, and labor and government increase of purchasing power had increased the farmers' home market was undoubtedly true; whether this return of purchasing power was due only to the government's aid, whether the recovery might not have been greater without it, were questions of interpretation at issue between the parties.

Fifth: that the conservation program had laid the basis for a permanent plenty was a strong statement in the light of its unsettled nature and its assumption of having solved the problem of surplus production. That
Landon had presented such a program two years before and had it rejected by the national government reduced the President's claim of accomplishment. Roosevelt's qualification of the idea of "plenty" as "a permanent plenty" was implicit refutation of the charge of promoting scarcity, such as Landon had made in his Des Moines speech. (Vital Speeches, 2:820, October 1, 1936, "A Workable Farm Program").

Sixth: that Democratic acts had added to the farmers' welfare was a justifiable claim. As early as 1919 Nebraska had sought to establish public power districts (The Annals of The American Academy of Political And Social Science, 201:85, January, 1939, "Rural Electrification in the United States," John M. Carmody), and thus appreciated the Rural Electrification Administration Act of 1936 which set up a ten-year program planning to make $410,000,000 available for rural electrification. (Ibid., p. 82). The President's appeal to his audience's knowledge of this program was pathetic proof through recognition. His claim of aid in the matter of roads was justified through the Federal Government's completion of 992 miles of emergency mileage in Nebraska prior to January 1, 1936. (The Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1936, p. 362). His claim of aid to rural schools was justified through the Federal expenditure of more than $667,000,000 for the three years ending June 30, 1936. Educational Yearbook, 1936, I. L. Kandel (editor), Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, New York, 1936. His listing of the benefits to the farm families echoed Landon's promises of the Des Moines address (Vital Speeches, 2:822, October 1, 1936, "A Workable Farm Program"), raising the farmers' value in their own eyes by labeling such results as their "fair share."

Seventh: that "immediate and direct relief" was sent to drought areas was readily acceptable to an audience at that very moment listed for an increase of Federal relief appropriation. Persuasiveness was gained by placing this "sentence" in the final position, for it struck the listeners at their most primary level, that of self-preservation. Choice of words increased the effect of swift answer to the need: "we rushed immediate and direct relief to the farmers and stockmen." Depreciation of the opponents' argument of "waste and extravagance" was effective but invalid because it attached the charge to the whole policy, a distortion approaching a fallacy of equivocation.
Roosevelt's balancing of the words "waste" and "wise" involved pathetic power in its identification and segregation of forces and gained artistic value in its rhythm and vowel strength through its substitution of "wise" for the noun which might have been expected, "wisdom."

intended effect. The conclusion to this specification of "the record" left the decision as to Democratic "determination" and "capacity to carry this program through" to the farm families, a recognition of their good judgment. The validity of this argument depended upon the listener's interpretation of "program"; he might identify the term with goals rather than with procedures, as Roosevelt did; he might identify the term with specific projects, as Roosevelt's opponents did, and thus question his actions and promises. To his audience of Democratic adherents in Aksarben Coliseum, this pledge, delivered with great force, doubtless carried conviction.

The Republicans do not offer a good plan for agriculture

Roosevelt opened this phase of argument with a question:

After having neglected a twelve-year opportunity for help to the American farmer, as his condition got worse and worse, what does Republican leadership now offer?

Both the reminder of past neglect and the challenging tone of the question produced a disparaging effect. Three
aspects of the Republican plans were considered: (1) scrapping of the Democratic program, (2) substitution of tariff-equivalent payments, and (3) repeal of the reciprocal tariff act.

Roosevelt's refutation of the Republican plan to scrap his program was done by assertion. His statement that Republican leadership had "condemned it as a 'subterfuge' and a 'stopgap'" was a misinterpretation of Landon's declaration in his Des Moines address that the use of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment act to cover the purposes of the invalidated Agricultural Adjustment Act was "a stopgap, a subterfuge." \(^{54}\) Landon's characterization can be justified, \(^{55}\) but Roosevelt's use of the charge as referring to the whole program was fallacious. Contrast on the basis of previously presented argument was the only proof offered. His complacent and slightly scornful use of

\(^{54}\) Vital Speeches, 2:821, October 1, 1936, "A Workable Farm Program."

\(^{55}\) Hacker pointed out that the Soil Conservation Act "obviously was only an expedient. It could have no real effects in guiding production; and the Brookings Institution quite properly characterized the program as the subsidy of 'uneconomic operations in response to political and sectional pressures.'" Op. cit., p. 211.
stereotypes -- "free competition" and "rugged individualism"\textsuperscript{56} -- assumed that his audience agreed with his

\textsuperscript{56} Hoover wrote in regard to "rugged individualism": "This term is lately clothed in false habiliments of careless disregard of public welfare and daily demolished with hot invective.... While I can make no claim for having introduced the term 'rugged individualism,' I should be proud to have invented it. It has been used by American leaders for over a half-century in eulogy of those God-fearing men and women of honesty whose stamina and character and fearless assertion of rights led them to make their own way in life." Ray L. Wilbur and Arthur M. Hyde, The Hoover Policies, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1937, p. 14.

decision, an effective suggestive device with an integrated audience. Since the farmer had been led to covet the feeling of national understanding and national support, this reversion to the idea of a man standing alone against the elements was a forceful one to the Nebraska farmers.

The second Republican suggestion -- tariff equivalent payments -- Roosevelt minimized in the very way in which he stated it, by employing two devices: one, hesitation on the name of the plan as though it were too unfamiliar for one to be really certain of it; and the other, verbalization of this hesitation with the words, "I think they are called." It was indeed unlikely that Roosevelt, with his unusual aptitude for word-selection, was doubtful of the term, "tariff-equivalent payments," but pretended
the hesitation for rhetorical effect. Power of depreciation lay also in his use of the word "dole" in characterization of the plan.

More logical refutation took the form of direct attack on the tariff-equivalent payments with causal reasoning. He pointed out that only four products would be covered by this plan, and listed the farmers whose crops would not qualify for these payments. This direct, forceful reasoning was closed with a barrage of questions on the effect of such a narrow plan and with a dogmatic assertion, fallacious through its over-statement, but effective through repetition. Logical refutation also took the form of an analogy with the new Republican plan and the Farm Board, which was justifiable through the concern of both with surpluses in specific products. This analogy was vigorously asserted and closed with the specific detail of "nine cents for corn," bringing the general prediction vividly within the experience of the farmer listeners.

Roosevelt's third charge, that the Republicans would repeal the reciprocal tariff act and return to the Smoot-Hawley policy, was a misinterpretation of the stand which Landon had taken in his Minneapolis address.57

57Landon held that the law had been applied to the wrong countries, that the free extension of the most-
Roosevelt's interpretation of Landon's suggestions was doubtless that the "selective bargaining" with foreign nations would cut the heart out of the reciprocal trade plan; nevertheless, his statement of his opponent's position was overdrawn. Roosevelt was correct in his declaration that a new Republican administration would attempt to "reject" the present reciprocal trade act, for such was the declaration of the Republican platform.

His light, half-amused tone on the words "Republican leaders" assumed the understanding and agreement of his audience. Roosevelt used the power of falling inflection to show the impressiveness or the cost of this program and its danger to the nation, and then a wavering, inconclusive tone to point out the inconsistency between this expensive program advocated in the West and the curtailment of expenditures advocated in the East. 58 Roosevelt

58 Landon had claimed, of course, that curtailment would come from the elimination of waste and extravagance in his Buffalo, New York, address of August 26, 1936. Ibid., 2:784, September 15, 1936, "Federal and Family Finances." A month later, in Des Moines, Iowa, he had declared that he would use "the full power of government
to relieve the present distress" and would "fulfill all outstanding obligations made by the present administration with the American farmer." Ibid., 2:820, October 1, 1936, "A Workable Farm Program."

refused to understand that the reductions advocated by Landon were to come from more efficient administration of relief rather than by its curtailment. Vagueness on this issue served well the interests of each candidate before his adherents.

Roosevelt's climax of this review of the Republican promises with dynamic questions, the second of which fell to a level of vituperation not often heard in Roosevelt's addresses, returned to the pathetic appeal of holding the question open to the judgment of the listeners. The words "inconsistent" and "campaign-devised" were in the key of Roosevelt's usual dignified, though severe, characterizations, but "half-baked" was a colloquialism which might have been an attempt to meet Landon on the level to which he had descended in his reference to the Roosevelt-sponsored corporation tax as "the most cockeyed piece of tax legislation ever imposed in a modern country." 59 Roosevelt had pointed

59Ibid., 2:764, September 15, 1936, "Federal and Family Finances." During the campaign speakers other than the candidates had resorted to questionable methods of accusation. "Leaders like Alfred E. Smith, Hugh Johnson, Harold Ickes, Father Coughlin, Herbert Hoover, and Ogden Mills resorted to accusations that even politicians usually
try to avoid." (Newsweek, 8:8, November 7, 1936). "By and large, Messrs. Roosevelt and Landon kept their heads." 

"By and large, Messrs. Roosevelt and Landon kept their heads." 

Ibid.

out the desirability of refraining from "relapse into exaggeration and invective" in a campaign year in his telephoned address to the New York Herald Tribune Forum, September 23, 1936. 60 The lapse to extreme colloquialism was somewhat continued in the stout assertion which followed with a derogatory effect, "and they know they cannot keep them!"

The Democratic program is desirable

Roosevelt's defense of his own plans opened with the acceptance and use of Landon's analogy of Democratic farm program changes with changes in automobile models 61 to

61 Landon had said in his farm speech in Des Moines, Iowa, on September 22, 1936, that "Like the automobile manufacturers the administration believes in bringing out a new model every year." Vital Speeches, 2:821, October 1, 1936, "A Workable Farm Program."

the support of his own constantly-improved program; he used this method of refutation, turning the tables, to great effect in pointing out that (1) the government had been
backed by the people during the adjustments, (2) conditions were better today through the changes, and (3) no one wants to go back to "yesterday's model", thus using the force of his opponent's assertion to enforce contentions of his own.

The President explained the Democratic program under three divisions: conservation, farm tenancy, crop insurance. His argument on conservation declared it as basic to his program and quoted an address he had made before the Supreme Court's invalidation of the Triple A to show that he had planned to change his emergency action into a more permanent one, as evidence of this long purpose.

In the presentation of this evidence he misspoke, saying "months after the action of the Supreme Court on the Triple A," then hurriedly declaring, "I mean months before that action." This is the only example of verbal recognition of a "bumble", as he called such errors, in his addresses of this campaign, but its complete reversal of his meaning on an issue otherwise unmentioned prevented him from ignoring the mistake, as he had done with the two "bumbles", less serious in nature, made earlier in this address.

Roosevelt's reiteration of the explanation of the
desirable plenty as the "continuous plenty" allowed him a chance to denounce waste, an implicit refutation of the repeated Republican campaign charge, and to reevaluate waste in a high key, including a reference to God, 63 and to make another appeal to the understanding of his hearers with the words, "Increasing production alone in an unlimited way appeals to no person who thinks the problem through." The encouragement of greater consumption 64 was an alternative attack on the question of over-production, one which shifted the argument to ground less easily attacked by his opponents.

63 Roosevelt's body-guard reported that "The Boss was more than moderately religious..." Michael F. Reilly, op. cit., p. 60. Frances Perkins pointed out the "naturalness" of Roosevelt's appeal to religion, declaring that he believed with "certainty and simplicity". Op. cit., p. 143, 141.

64 It would take "10% more than the acreage required to produce the type of food apparently consumed during 1927-31" to give a liberal yearly per capita diet to the population of the United States. (Hazel K. Stiebeling and Medora M. Ward, Diets at Four Levels of Nutritive Content and Cost, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., November, 1933, p. 5.) Thus, the President's calculation that forty-five million more acres could well be used in domestic production was slightly exaggerated, as the land used for crops in 1929 was only 371,949,000 acres, (The Statistical Abstract of the United States of 1935, p. 587) and the 10% would be just over 37,000,000 acres. It should be noted that the President's prepared manuscript had the figure, 40,000,000 acres.
Roosevelt's second suggestion -- that of attacking the evil of farm tenancy -- was cast much along the lines which Landon had taken in his farm speech at Des Moines, Iowa, but Roosevelt could point to advances won and activities planned.

Landon had declared, "If history teaches us anything, it teaches that the stability or civilization depends upon ownership of the land by the man who works the land." Vital Speeches, 2:822, October 1, 1936, "A Workable Farm Program." Both speakers claimed tenancy a severe problem, suggested the family-owned farm as the desired goal.

The third suggestion (of crop insurance) was used principally to tie the welfare of farmer and consumer together, allowing repetition of the assertion that he was giving the same speech to the farmers of the West and to the consumers of the East. Throughout this argument Roosevelt used the powerful repetitive force of denial of one course, affirmation of the other.

It is worthy of note that the three positive suggestions which Roosevelt made -- conservation, solution of the tenancy problem, crop insurance -- had all been advocated by Landon. Thus, of the four points in Landon's
program, Roosevelt vigorously attacked one -- the tariff-equivalent payments -- and advocated three without mentioning Landon's support of them, giving the careful impression that his advocacy was of long standing and already under way. Doubtless such a technique of ignoring Landon's stand removed him from the position of linking himself with his opponent as he pointed out the differences in their approach. However, his restatement of the administration's concern for the farmer was strongly reminiscent of Landon's appeal for security, opportunity and a fair share for the farmer.  

The main difference lay in the artistry of the language: Landon asked for "the comforts of modern labor-saving devices" for the farm wives, Roosevelt asked for "a share for farmers in the good things of life abundant enough to satisfy and preserve our instinctive faith in the land"; Landon touched the prosaic note; Roosevelt reached the more fundamental feeling of the land-owner.

The Democrats plan for an "abundant" farm life

Both speeches close with a tribute to the farmer.

Landon declared:

These are the people that give us security and
Roosevelt added the idea of the farmer as "our ideal of self-reliance and of spiritual balance," a tribute to the audience-members whom he had repeatedly asked to consider the questions of agriculture with him. Landon's idea of the dependence of the nation upon the strength of its farmers was lifted from its vagueness with an analogy of the reservoir -- imagery vivid to a farming audience -- and a reference to Greek mythology which was especially apt in its picturization and pleasing to the prairie audience with its learned flavor. Strong utterance of the desire to keep the strength of "the ancient virtues" as well as to gain the new "advantages" integrated the farmer into the fabric of a "well-rounded life" for the nation, and thus increased his self-respect by linking him with a goal above and beyond himself.

**Summary and Interpretation**

Roosevelt presented an address of high artistic quality and oratorical power in Omaha, Nebraska, on October 10, 1930. Addressing 12,000 Nebraskans and Iowans in the Aksarben hall and other thousands outside the building.
over loud speakers, as well as his unseen radio listeners, Roosevelt assured the people of this farm area of their importance in the national picture.

The farmer was important in the Democratic campaign of 1936, not only because agriculture was basic to the nation's welfare in the President's thinking, but because the farmer's support of the New Deal was by no means certain. Landon's strong effort to win the farm belt to his candidacy and the drought of midsummer with resulting shortages which forcibly brought into question the administration's policy or production curtailment -- these factors were jeopardizing Roosevelt's hold on the farm vote, despite the fact that increases in farm relief measures were being instituted. The farmers must choose between parties whose platforms on agriculture were basically similar; the farmers also had a difficult decision to make between the candidates -- between Roosevelt, whose major agricultural agency had been invalidated by the Supreme Court but now replaced by other instrumentalities, whose mistakes were dynamically clear to some and as forcefully denied by others; and Landon, who, though a man from the Midwest agricultural area, could only counter achievements with promises. There was definitely a need for a Presidential address in the Midwest on agriculture.
The reelection of George Norris, veteran Republican New Deal Senator from Nebraska, again a candidate through the petition of thousands, was in doubt. A speech from Roosevelt might turn the tide.

Thus Roosevelt came to Omaha to lend support to the candidacy of his old friend and to make the Democratic stand on agriculture clear to the Midwest voters.

**Ideas and logical proofs**

Roosevelt opened with high praise of the veteran Senator and a strong plea, on the basis of Norris's long "career of service" to the country, for his reelection.

Analyzing the farmers' plight in 1932 as the result of surpluses caused by reduction of European markets, a condition worsened by the Republican Farm Board and Smoot-Hawley tariff, he set forth a more thorough contrast of Republican and Democratic action on a problem than in any other address of the campaign. He took up the actions and attitudes of both parties toward the farm problem, and analyzed the results their policies had brought.

Roosevelt's condemnation of the Republican policies was justified: the Farm Board had increased surpluses, and the Smoot-Hawley tariff had further reduced foreign markets. He overdrew the attitude of "defeatism," which he imputed to them, but his charge that they felt help to
the farmer was a waste of money was substantiated by Re­
publican loss of faith in their own program. Roosevelt's
attack on the present plan of the Republicans for agri­
culture was made from several directions. He argued by
effective causal reasoning that the tariff-equivalent pay­
ments would cover too few products to solve the problem of
surpluses, and by valid analogy with the Farm Board that
the surpluses would even be increased. He offered two
strong additional reasons for rejecting the Republican pro­
posals -- that this unsatisfactory plan would be costly,
and that Republican promises for reducing expenditures, if
carried out, would make their fulfillment of their promises
to agriculture impossible.

On the other hand, Roosevelt pointed out, the
Democrats had proceeded on the convictions that agriculture
was the nation's problem and that the farm policy should
be guided by farmers, both of these valid and both well
enunciated before an agricultural audience. Although
Roosevelt failed to allow the effect of the drought in
raising the present farm income and overdraw the effects
of his plan for conservation of resources, yet his array
of seven steps which the Democratic administration had
taken for agriculture was effective portrayal. He speci­
ified the measures taken to raise the farmers' net income,
to deal with foreclosure and debt, to begin to regain the farmers' markets, to begin to expand the home market, to end the waste or natural resources, to give the farmers' their share in the advantages of modern life, and to give immediate aid in drought; these were strong proof of Democratic interest in the farmers' welfare to the Midwest listeners who had benefited personally from many of them.

Turning the tables effectively on Landon's comparison of the Democratic farm policies with changing car models by pointing to the improvements gained by these changes, Roosevelt clarified the present farm program as attacking the problems of production, tenancy, and fluctuations of price and supply. Of Landon's program set forth at Des Moines, he omitted only the tariff-equivalent payment plan, which he had vigorously attacked. Roosevelt's stand on over-production was particularly well taken, for he had frequently been charged with advocating the policy of scarcity. Declaring himself for a program of "continuous plenty" and against waste, he effectively shifted the ground of the argument by advocating increased consumption of farm products as an additional answer to the problem of surpluses.

Thus, Roosevelt pointed out the weaknesses in the Republican stand vigorously, emphasized the achievements
of the Democrats for agriculture and clarified their plans for the future.

**Ethical proofs**

Roosevelt's presentation of the farm problem showed him a leader with a well-reasoned view of agriculture -- he saw the farmer's position in the national picture; he recognized the need of the farmer's help in setting up the policies; he understood the farmer's right to a share in the advantages of modern living, to security for his old people and opportunities for his children. Showing that the Democratic aid to the farmers had redeemed his pledge to them was effective in demonstrating his integrity.

Roosevelt's reputation was held powerfully in view in his recital of what the past administration had done for the farmer. This note of past accomplishment as the reason for faith in his plans for the farmer's future ran throughout the speech, forming an important part of the contrast drawn with Republican promises. Here, as in the Chicago address to the small business men, Roosevelt used his record of past action effectively to assure a specific group of his interest in their welfare.

**Pathetic proofs**

Roosevelt's appeal to the basic drives of self-
preservation, love of family and home, self-esteem, and ownership of property was particularly strong in this address. He pointed to the benefits that his past actions had brought them — relief from the fear of foreclosure, aid in time of drought, increase in net income — benefits which concerned their homes and families. Furthermore, his goal of family-ownership of farms to replace tenancy and his claim that the nation needed to draw strength from the "self-reliance" and the "spiritual balance" of the farmers held powerful motivative appeals for the agricultural audience.

The premise, which was, perhaps, most pleasing to the listeners, of Roosevelt's whole line of thought was that the farmers constituted an important part of the national structure and that their welfare was a concern of the whole nation. Such a basic stand on the President's part seemed proof of the government's attention to their basic needs and recognition of their value.

Arrangement

Roosevelt's extended solicitation of support for Senator Norris was not integrated with the remainder of the address; it is probable that the double purpose of the speech — to urge the reelection of Norris and to uphold the Democratic program for agriculture — was better served
by maintaining this separation. After this declaration for Norris, Roosevelt presented a unified argument on the single theme that Democratic government, in contrast to Republican administrations, had acted and would act for the farmer in line with his best interests.

In this discussion, the President followed the pattern of rational thinking -- specifying the farmer's plight, analyzing its cause as surplus products, delineating the Republican failure to solve the problem of surpluses and the Democratic success in bringing relief to the farmer's plight, specifying the proposed Republican position as a return to the unsuccessful policies of the past, and urging the adoption of the Democratic program because of its formulation in his best interests. Roosevelt kept the line of thinking clearly before his audience by the continued use of transitional questions.

The President apportioned his time well between the explanation of past and proposed programs of the parties; he characterized the past Republican program vividly but briefer and then presented his successful efforts for the farmers in much greater detail; as to the present programs, he refuted the Republican suggestions pointedly and spent twice as much time setting up his plans for agriculture. Such arrangement aided in keeping the emphasis upon the
solution which he wished them to adopt.

Language

Language was used with powerful effect in this address. Particularly effective was the choice of words, imagery, and allusions to touch the vivid experience of Roosevelt's farmer audience. The method of disparaging an idea before attacking it directly -- a method used repeatedly by the President throughout this campaign -- was made particularly effective for the Midwest by the use of colloquial terms.

Roosevelt demonstrated the power of vivid, concrete words and imagery never more clearly than in this address, for he concluded on the same note -- continued interest in the farmers' welfare and appreciation of his part in the national structure -- as had Landon, yet his expression rose significantly above the prosaic phrasing of his opponent.

Delivery

The President delivered this address to his Midwest audience with a high degree of directness and informality. In no other speech of the campaign did he more clearly guide, by use of his voice, the audience in their manifestations of approval. Perhaps the enthusiasm of his
listeners encouraged him to react, even more strongly than his usual practice was, to the implications of his ideas; he represented scorn, amusement, gravity, challenge, strong conviction by changes of voice. He ended with a strong, determined conclusion, which fitted effectively the informal delivery he had used throughout, but which lacked the uplifted, oratorical quality of a great address such as the one in Philadelphia had been.

Thus, Roosevelt, addressing an excited Midwest audience and more critical radio listeners throughout the land, presented the administration's stand on agriculture, playing on his hearers with effective marshalling of ideas, with vigorous use of language and voice. The farm audience was excited by his presence and his address; their response stimulated Roosevelt to greater informality and directness. He presented an address well suited to win the farm voters back to his support.

Reactions to the Speech

The President told Mayor Dan Butler of Omaha on the way to the train at the conclusion of the address that he had never before had such an appreciative audience.69

69Omaha World Herald, October 11, 1936.
At times during the address the crowd responded so sharply to the President's sallies at the Republicans that he was prevented from finishing his sentences. The crowd seemed to startle the speaker with its shouts of "No!" to his questions concerning turning the administration back to the Republicans. "Perhaps the greatest demonstration came in response to a line by which the President himself apparently set no great store, since he did not emphasize it especially his suggestion of growing trade bringing international peace."

Ibid.

John T. Lambert pointed out that Roosevelt's Omaha speech was privately criticized on the basis that it might give his opponents too many openings, as in his defense of the tariff-trade treaties, for example. It had been urged in August that the Democrats' chief task was to answer the Republican argument that the reciprocal trade treaties and production control had sacrificed the domestic market; planners of the farm campaign felt that adequate statistical proof existed but "the more important thing is the persons rather than the figures used to
refute them."\textsuperscript{72} Hence, the enthusiastic reception of Roosevelt's speech, which included his defense of the reciprocal trade agreements, probably improved his position on this issue as well.

Roosevelt's overstatement of Democratic credit in the improvement of the farmers' income was challenged in view of the survey of world economic conditions prepared for the League of Nations, which cited "world-wide industrial recovery" as the major factor.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{73}\textit{Washington Post}, October 14, 1936

The cost of the Democratic farm program impressed the Republican Committee, who issued a statement the following day (October 11) thanking Roosevelt for proving in his Omaha address that spenders couldn't be "trusted to balance the budget."\textsuperscript{74} Nevertheless, the idea of money in the farmers' pockets was compelling with his audience of Nebraskan voters, for their cheers showed this was his most effective argument.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{75}\textit{Time}, 28: 15, October 19, 1936.
Despite the degree of appreciation which his audience at Omaha rendered him, Roosevelt continued his militant attitude as he pushed westward to Cheyenne, Wyoming, and Denver, Colorado. Whether Roosevelt felt that the Midwest states were truly "doubtful" or whether he desired to win again the plurality of 1932, there was no doubt of the purposefulness of his campaigning. Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen pointed out that "he has made up a lot of his earlier losses on this last tour." 

Although one reporter declared that his voice was a bit "flat" from strenuous campaigning, yet the effectiveness of his utterance made Columnist Mark Sullivan
declare: "He could recite the Polish alphabet and it would be accepted as an eloquent plea for disarmament."  

Ibid., p. 12, October 26, 1936.

Thus, Roosevelt seems to have met the situation with arguments and presentation highly acceptable to his immediate audience, regardless of minor weaknesses in reasoning and interpretation. It is likely that Roosevelt's radio audiences throughout the Midwest reacted in a comparable fashion, but that listeners in non-agricultural areas, at least those not completely at one with Roosevelt's premise of interdependence, deplored the promises of large governmental expenditures.
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Chapter V

THE ADDRESS AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, OCTOBER 14, 1936

The Background

On October 9, 1936, Chicago had paraded for Landon, who spoke that evening in the Stadium on the federal budget. That same evening Roosevelt had spoken on agricultural problems in St. Paul, Minnesota, after a day of rear-platform remarks and political conferences.¹

¹Ex-Governor Ely of Massachusetts had pointed to the merging of the Democrats in Minnesota with the Farmer-Labor party, which advocated government operation of key industries, as highly significant and even sinister. New York Times, October 16, 1936.

The "MidWest" had become "one huge debating platform,"²

²News-Week, 8:13, October 24, 1936, "Campaign: Nominees Refute Each Other..."

with Landon making an eight-day run through six Lake states and Roosevelt a tour of equal length through states stretching slightly farther west. The larger crowds and the greater ovations went to the President.³

³Ibid.
but in the case of Al Smith in 1928 mighty ovations had not meant votes. David Lawrence pointed out that Roosevelt had travelled more miles than Landon in the months after the nominating conventions and had concentrated his visits to states in the doubtful or close category.4

4New York Sun, October 14, 1936.

Certain factors could not be appraised in their full significance at this time, yet Roosevelt seemed to feel a change of spirit, from one of militancy such as he had evidenced in Omaha to one of "jovial neighborliness, of confidence without cockiness," as he turned eastward.

5Noting the pro-Roosevelt trend, the Washington Post listed factors whose effect was still undetermined: the unprecedented increase in registered voters in all parts of the country; the conflicting reports of polls; effect of the Townsend votes for Landon in California; the effect of the more aggressive type of campaign by both Landon and Roosevelt; the effect of the party bolts. October 11, 1936.

6News-Week, 8: 14, October 24, 1936, "Campaign: Nominees Refute Each Other..."

His confidence seemed to have been heightened considerably by the reaction to his Denver address on the cattle and the conservation programs, despite the reports from his political advisers that the National Democratic ticket
had "little more than an even chance to carry the Mountain States."  

---


---

Declaring in all his rear-platform talks through Colorado and Kansas that conditions were greatly improved over those of 1932, Roosevelt pointed out at Wichita on October 12, 1936, "It looks to me as if things are a little bit better than they were in this section four years ago..." *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, Vol. V, p. 452.

---

October 13, 1936, that even Kansas had been helped by the Federal Government. At Kansas City, Missouri, he emphasized the government's provision of opportunities for the youth; St. Louis, a traditionally Republican city which had, however given Roosevelt a majority in 1932, now gave him a huge ovation at his dedication of the War Memorial. He made six stops at large cities on the way
from St. Louis to Chicago, greeted by bands and banners, one of which (in Alton, Illinois) read, "Sunflowers Die in November." 12

12 New York Times, October 15, 1936. The Republicans had adopted the flower of Landon's home state as their symbol; withering of the flower in the fall made an apt comparison for the prediction of Landon's defeat in the election.

A month before, Turner Catledge had pointed out that the series of parleys which Roosevelt had begun with the conference of power company executives and government experts would include "every major segment of private enterprise." 13 Throughout the President's western tour,

13 "The aim would be to reassure them as to his future governmental plans, and, incidentally, to soften the violence of opposition from this source to his reelection." New York Times, September 21, 1936.

he had been told by state leaders and candidates that his chief opposition in the area came from small and medium size business men, that the farmers had been warming to his reelection as the climax of the campaign approached. 14

14 "In addition to the president and his aids receiving those reports, Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace... has had them repeatedly from farm leaders who have been flocking to the train to talk with him." Chicago Daily News, October 15, 1936, Paul R. Leach.
The need for placating the small business men must have impressed itself upon Roosevelt in relationship to his bid for the 29 electoral votes of Illinois, a state listed by both camps as doubtful,15 with "a slight leaning to the Republican camp."16

15George Gallup predicted that at this time neither Landon nor Roosevelt would be able to poll more than 53% of the major party vote in Illinois. Washington Post, October 11, 1936.

16Ibid., October 16, 1936. The downstate section was slipping back to the "Republican fold" in 1936, but in Chicago the Democratic lead was increased; and since 1928 half the Illinois vote has come from Cook County. Gosnell, op. cit., pp. 92, 94.

Thus the problem became more clear: the agricultural voters were becoming more favorable to Roosevelt and had been directly challenged by his visits to their part of the country and by his conferences with their leaders; business men were more likely than other voters to remember his denunciation of the "economic royalists," as in his Philadelphia address, and the new corporation profits tax, and to feel themselves an out-group in the national picture.

The Audience

Twenty-six thousand persons were gathered in
the Stadium\textsuperscript{17} to hear the President's address. Outside

\textsuperscript{17}\textit{New York Times}, October 15, 1936, Charles W. Hurd.

were one-hundred thousand (or more)\textsuperscript{18} unable to get in-

\textsuperscript{18}The radio announcer spoke of a crowd estimated at

more than one hundred thousand (from the N.B.C. recording

of the proceedings); Mayor Kelly's opening remarks spoke

of "the vast assemblage inside the Stadium and the 150,000

people who marched on foot to this meeting and are now

unable to get inside..." \textit{Ibid.}

side and listening to the address through loud speakers.

The fortunate ones in the Stadium were kept aware of the

increasing size of the horde outside by the noise of the

marching bands.\textsuperscript{19} These in the stadium were also made

\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Chicago Daily News}, October 15, 1936, Warren Phinney.

conscious of the vast radio audience to be reached by this

address by the battery of radio paraphernalia and announc-

ers to be seen just below the speaker's stand.\textsuperscript{20} Fur-

\textsuperscript{20}The radio setup was one of the most extensive of

all time. Hooked into the microphones circling the speakers' stand were 163 stations; Columbia had 102 stations linked to its setup." \textit{Ibid.}

thermore, they were reminded of the huge audience the

speech would have through newspaper coverage by the press box section with its provision for 320 reporters and
This throng of city dwellers formed a mighty audience, its size and enthusiasm a surprise even to the local Democratic leaders, who had worked for weeks to organize a fitting reception for the President.

The parade lasted for two and a half hours, with perhaps 150,000 marching and another 100,000 standing in closely-packed ranks on the sidewalks. Flags, banners, bands, confetti increased the enthusiasm of the marchers and the watchers. Despite the zeal evidenced in this parade, the presence of many of the marchers had been
required by their unions. 26 The President's car and

26 An excerpt from the orders sent out by Local 66 of the Elevator Operators and Starters Union reads as follows: "Every member must be in the line of march. Stewards must report, list and account for all their men present. Only those members who are employed nights are exempt." The secretary of the Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers Union, No. 611, sent out this command: "You are requested to be in a parade. This parade is very urgent and you are subject to be fined, should you not appear, by the P.C.D." Chicago Daily News, October 15, 1936.

motorcycle escort of thirty policemen overtook the parade as it proceeded "between densely packed lines of spectators on Madison St. He was greeted by waves of applause as he swept by on his way to the Chicago Stadium..." 27


These thousands of union laborers, many of them in working clothes as a tribute to the President's interest in labor, and Democratic ward groups formed a listening throng outside the building; their presence was impressed by the sound of their bands and their cheers upon the group inside, about half of whom had waited for over three hours for the doors to be opened to admit them to their envied positions. 28 The nine

hundred seats on the speakers' platform provided an additional audience factor.

Thus, the audience for the President's speech was composed of the 26,000 in the Stadium, a portion of that number seated on the stage; over 100,000 outside, able to hear but not to see the President; and millions of listeners in the twenty million radio homes of the United States. 29 Doubtless, most of these in the throngs within and without the Stadium held strongly-favorable attitudes toward the President; however, the immense radio coverage of the address probably brought bitter antagonists as well as strong adherents within hearing of his words.

The Immediate Setting of the Speech

Charles W. Hurd pointed out that the Stadium had not been in such festive attire even for the National Convention of 1932. 30 Inside the building strong calcium


30 "Great floodlights with colored shields before them threw a rainbow across the white-walled structure
lights were spotted on the speakers' stand.

Only one picture was shown in the Stadium, an oil painting of the President, suspended below the organ loft. In contrast to the thousands of banners displayed along the streets, only one was exhibited inside, a banner declaring, "Not a national bank failure from October, 1935, to October, 1936." "High against the roof" were displayed two maps, one showing the location of 8,923 bank suspensions "before Roosevelt" and the other, the location of 66 which had failed after he had become President.

The strong pathetic appeal of these significant references to Roosevelt's achievements was enhanced by the efforts of other speakers who had "prepared" the audience for more than an hour before the president's address; he found "a receptive audience for his
thesis.  

County President Clayton Smith acted as chairman; other speakers were Senator James H. Lewis, States Attorney Thomas J. Courtney, the President of the Illinois State Federation of Labor. Governor Horner, who had been renominated against the opposition of the Democratic machine, drew a round of applause with his statement:

Illinois will win for Roosevelt. Our president has done better than anyone else could have done.  

Also on the platform were Mayor Kelly, who was to introduce the President; Patrick Nash, who was to preside; Mrs. Roosevelt; James Farley; Senator Dieterich of Illinois; Senator O'Mahoney of Wyoming; Presidential Secretary McIntyre; Senator Pittman of Nevada; Senator Wheeler of Montana; and Breckenridge Long, friend of the President.  

Ibid., October 14, 1936.
The Stadium organ set the audience cheering with "Happy Days are Here Again" and, when the President came upon the stage, the crowd leaped to its feet and cheered and yelled for twelve minutes. 37 As 9:30 approached, County Chairman Smith succeeded in quieting the din. Phinney reported:

10,000 little flags stopped waving; calcium lights spotted on the president were turned off; the vast crowd settled into quiet. 38

Mayor Kelly introduced the President with great praise of his activities for public improvements and savings to the taxpayers of Chicago. 39 The Stadium

37Ibid., October 15, 1936, Warren Phinney.

38Ibid.

39"Now that the cheering for the President has subsided, I will conclude by saying that the vast assemblage inside the Stadium and the one hundred and fifty thousand people who marched on foot to this meeting and are now unable to get inside constitute the best evidence of how the people of Chicago have taken our great President to their hearts.

"As Mayor I want to publicly thank the President for his magnificent accomplishments in the way of public improvements and savings to the local taxpayers in the metropolitan district. The man we honor tonight has given America back to the people for whose benefit this great nation was founded, thus creating a feeling of renewed patriotism, our surest guarantee against conditions like we find in Spain and other Countries. For
this alone, the country should thank God for Roosevelt! /Applause/

"This is a day of days for Chicago and I'm respectfully asking, at the request of those in charge of the meeting, that the President be not interrupted with applause during his speech, due to the shortness of time in which he has to deliver it. When we can be host to the greatest President that America ever has known, Chicago is indeed fortunate.

"Ladies and Gentlemen, The President of the United States!" Taken by the writer from the rerecording of the proceedings made by the National Broadcasting Company.

organ burst forth with "Happy Days are Here Again."

When the President stepped to the microphones another thunderous ovation broke out, a display which he stopped

40"Delayed five minutes in starting by his introduction and the demonstration when he stepped to the speaker's stand, President Roosevelt exceeded the half-hour radio space by six minutes." New York Times, October 15, 1936, Charles W. Hurd.

as quickly as he could because his half hour of radio time was already passing by.

Roosevelt's radio audience heard the announcers describing the setting and the introduction by Mayor

41The National Broadcasting Company network carried this description:

"Good evening, Ladies & Gentlemen. The following program is presented under the sponsorship of the Democratic National Committee.

"Chicago, Illinois, the nation's second largest city, tonight opened her doors to bid the President of the United States welcome in one of the greatest demonstrations in the city's history."
"The thirty thousand people lucky enough to force their way into the Chicago Stadium have for many minutes been cheering and applauding the President, and he's been standing here on the platform smiling and waving his acknowledgment of their welcome. Surrounding the Stadium is a crowd estimated at more than one hundred thousand unable to get in; they will listen to his address through loud speakers. His honor, Mayor Edward J. Kelly of Chicago, will introduce the President. We present Mayor Kelly." Taken from the recording of the proceedings made for the writer by the National Broadcasting Company from their master records.

Kelly of Chicago. It is probable that the great enthusiasm of the audience present in Chicago was realized by the radio listeners through the bursts of cheering, shouting and band music which reached them over the air.

The President himself had seemed cheerful and optimistic, particularly since the time when, in the Denver address, he had struck the note of "prosperity" and had received a great ovation from the listeners. 42


His addresses, as he turned eastward again, had drawn great, responsive crowds. 43 On the day preceding his address in Chicago, Roosevelt said to a rear-platform audience in Carrollton, Missouri,
It has been a wonderful outpouring, a very wonderful reception, that I have had all through today; and let me tell you that I am very, very grateful for it....I am not the least bit afraid of the results as long as everybody gets out and votes.  

Doubtless, the packed streets in Chicago increased the President's awareness of the enthusiasm he was arousing; he must have approached the address in Chicago with confidence as well as strong purpose to win a city audience.

At the close of the President's address, he was cheered vigorously again, and the demonstration continued until he passed from the view of the crowd to enter the car waiting to return him to his train.

The President's salutation to the "Chairman, Governor Horner, Mayor Kelly" was followed by the
of A. J. Cermak, and then elected to the office in 1935 by the record vote of almost 800,000. He was a leader in the Chicago Recovery Administration and in solving municipal problems. He had organized the "Keep Chicago Ahead" Committee of business men to stimulate commercial activities. *Who's Who in America, 1936-1937.*

Warm, inclusive greeting, "my friends of the great State of Illinois." This coupled the President's well-known phrase of greeting with a pleasant tribute of characterization to Illinois.

Recovery has come to the country as a whole.

Roosevelt opened his address with the swiftly uttered, half-humorous, informal remark, "I seem to have been here before," which brought a burst of applause from the crowd that had just been brought to order; the rapport which this casual statement took for granted between himself and the listening thousands was strong suggestion to an already receptive audience. Thus he introduced a reference to his acceptance of the nomination in 1932 in the same hall in which he was now speaking, reminding his hearers of the unusual manner

---

The audience had been effectively polarized by being seated in close proximity, by cheering and standing together, by the free use of symbols—all methods of strong integration. Oliver pointed out that polarization is also increased by "emphasizing in the beginning
of the speech the things the audience agrees upon, so that there is established a strong initial tendency to go along with the speaker—"yes" response." Op. cit., p. 173.

of his arrival yet declaring himself "an old friend." 48

48 Roosevelt's appearance in Chicago on July 2, 1932, to accept the presidential nomination broke the tradition of delayed formal notification of nomination in dramatic fashion. General Hugh S. Johnson pointed out that "He delights in surprises—clever, cunning and quick. He likes to shock friends as well as enemies with something they have never expected—and especially to make sudden flank attacks and astonish the country with something new and spectacular." Reader's Digest, 32: 41, April, 1938, "Profile of a President."

Nevertheless, Roosevelt had known Chicago from boyhood. He travelled with his parents over most of the routes of the Louisville, New Albany and Chicago road (of which his father was president) and of the Delaware and Hudson (of which Mr. Roosevelt was vice-president). Also James Roosevelt was alternate commissioner of the World's Fair in Chicago and for this reason went to Chicago a number of times, taking his wife and son with him. Rita Halle Kleeman, Gracious Lady, D. Appleton-Century, New York, 1935, pp. 146-147.

His characterization of the Chicago of 1932 as "fighting with its back to the wall" was powerful in two ways: it implicitly commended Chicago's spirit while stressing her desperate need for succor. The balance of the vivid pictures of the Chicago of 1932 and of 1936 was effective in the strength of the contrasted memories it evoked for the Chicago listeners. Each of the cases cited in the picture of 1932 was characterized by a single conclusive adjective—"factories closed, markets silent, banks
shaky, ships and trains empty"; however, in the picture of 1936, each of the four cases had its own group of words descriptive of the vigorous activity now taking place, words powerful in their connotation and their rhythm—"factories sing the song of industry—markets hum with bustling movement—banks are secure—ships and trains are running full."

That Roosevelt characterized the Chicago of 1936 as the "Chicago that smiles" was reminiscent of his compliment to the nation as having "dared to smile through the storm" in his acceptance address in Philadelphia, June 27, 1936. Doubtless the overt expression of this attitude was completely in line with the immediate desires of Roosevelt's enthusiastic audience, and Roosevelt's suggestion was thus strong with pathetic appeal. The local significance of this attitude might have been weakened by Roosevelt's explanation that the nation was also cheerful had the idea of Chicago's cheer been merged with the nation's joy; rather, Chicago was retained as a special example and the nation ranged with it.  

49 The national audience would have found this inclusiveness of approach pleasant.

had established in this introductory passage an integration of audience through common rejoicing in recovery
accomplished.

The second phase of this integration was reinforced with a restatement of his belief in the interrelated nature of the country's occupations. Repetition, homely analogy and colloquial phraseology\(^{50}\) provide

\(^{50}\) Examples: "they are part and parcel of a rounded whole"; "I have driven that point home."

emphatic statement of the nation-wide character of this recovery.

The Roosevelt Administration brought recovery to workers in industry

The rhetorical device of showing the business men their part in the national scheme of recovery\(^{51}\) by

\(^{51}\) The pattern of the address is as follows:

I. Recovery has come to the country as a whole.

II. The Roosevelt administration brought recovery to workers in industry.
   A. It brought benefits to depositors.
   B. It brought benefits to investors.
   C. It brought benefits to merchants.
   D. It brought benefits to employers.
   E. It brought benefits to railroad men.
   F. It brought benefits to middlemen in farm products.

III. Recovery does not just "happen."
   A. It did not "happen" from 1929 to 1932.

IV. Republican administration did not bring recovery.
A. It wanted government aid administered at the top of the economic structure.
B. Its policies were controlled by high finance.

V. Democratic administration saved business.
A. It stopped inflation and falling prices.
B. It increased the purchasing power of industrial consumers in the cities.
C. It increased the purchasing power of farmers.
D. It decreased interest, power and transportation rates.
E. It protected business men from losses due to crime, bank robberies, kidnappers and blackmailers.
F. It increased employment.
G. It got more money into circulation.
H. It fought to break the grip of monopoly.

VI. Democratic administration is not antagonistic to business.
A. Record of recovery disproves the charge.
B. Roosevelt's declaration of belief in individualism except at the expense of society disproves it.

VII. All citizens are joined to preserve old ideals.

specifying the governmental activities which had brought recovery was a graphic means of answering the charge of the government's detrimental effects on business.

Roosevelt asked six direct questions conversationally but answered them with firmness. Each closed (with one exception) with a direct question or statement asking whether credit ought not be given the government for the welfare of business on that issue. The first such concluding request for agreement was cast in the metaphor
of accounting books, a comparison which doubtless came vividly within the experience of the business men and would have been recognized as pleasantly apt by other listeners.

Roosevelt supported his declaration of benefit to the depositor by reference to the guaranteeing of deposits as making them safer than at any other time.52

52 The Banking Act of 1933 provided that deposits were to be guaranteed through the creation of an agency known as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the capital for which was to be built up by subscriptions from the federal government, every Federal Reserve bank, and all banks becoming members of the insurance plan. (Hacker, op. cit., p. 239) As of December 3, 1936, 92.2% of the commercial banks of the country were thus insured or insured through state systems. Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1937, p. 249.

and by reference to the first full year in fifty-five without a national bank failure in the whole country.53

53 It should be recalled that displayed before the audience in the Chicago Stadium were two maps illustrating the difference in number of bank failures before and during Roosevelt's administration. Thus, the President opened his argument of government's benefits to business, citing—it so happened—an example which had been singled out for recognition as an outstanding contribution by planners of the Chicago rally.

This choice of opening argument was well-made in that the bank crisis and the President's swift handling of it had made an indelible impression on the country and
revival of this feeling would provide an affirmative mental set toward the arguments to follow.

Roosevelt pointed out next that the investor had benefited, for stocks and bonds were "up to a five or six year high level." The statistical truth of this claim was strong logical proof. That Roosevelt dealt first with savings and bonds was a significant reiteration of the Democratic answer to Colonel Knox's charge. This answer in no way met the challenge that the increased percent of government bonds in the banks was a grave danger. It should be noted that on July 14, 1936, the Board of Governors had increased the reserve requirements throughout the Federal Reserve system for the purpose
of reducing the excess bank reserves and averting the risk of inflation.\footnote{New York Times, July 17, 1936.} Thus, Knox's charge relative to bank reserves had been recognized and was being dealt with by the Democratic administration; however, his basic challenge that the whole credit structure of the government was in danger was not directly met.

The merchant, Roosevelt declared, had been benefited through the return of purchasing power, pointing to farmers and city workers as better customers.\footnote{Daniel C. Roper, Secretary of Commerce stated as evidence of the "wide sweep of economic recovery" in business and industry: "Since March, 1933, industrial production has advanced 68%; factory employment has gained 44%; factory pay rolls have increased 95%; rural general merchandise sales have risen 103%; automobile production in the United States has gained over 300%; electric power production increased 38%.... The total cash income from farm marketings rose more than two and one-half billions in the last three years; total cash wages paid to hired farm labor have increased more than twenty millions in the same period; prices of farm products have increased 98% since March, 1933." Philadelphia Record, June 23, 1936.}

The National Bureau of Economic Research, Incorporated, pointed out that "Findings...indicated that consumers in 1936 were approximately where they were in 1929.... Reviving activity had brought increases in the purchasing power of major consuming groups. Income arising from productive operations was swelled by heavy relief and benefit payments of the Federal government, and by relief payments of states and cities." Prices in Recession and Recovery, A Survey of Recent Changes, Frederick C. Mills, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., in
cooperation with the Committee on Recent Economic Changes, New York, 1936, pp. 419, 427.

increased income of farmers, however, when given as a total amount fails to make clear that this money was concentrated in the pockets of the farmers who had crops in this drought year and was absent from those of the farmers whose crops and livestock prospects were ruined by heat and dryness. Thus, the use of the argument that better incomes for farmers meant better customers involved a fallacy of division. That the farmers had smaller debts was true, not only because of the devaluation of the dollar but because of the refinancing of farm mortgages. The general increase of industrial production

Corn, the mainstay of the animal industries is about half a crop....The total production of the four chief feed grains—corn, oats, barley, and grain sorghums—appears likely to amount to....about 40% less than average." The Agricultural Situation, 20, No. 9: 1, September 1, 1936, Roy F. Hendrickson.

All farmers together have greater purchasing power; therefore, each farmer has greater purchasing power.

Farm mortgage indebtedness of all tenures had been reduced from over nine billion to seven and a half billion, a 17% change, from 1930 to 1935. Statistical Abstract of the United States of 1937, p. 595.
warranted the statement that city workers had more and surer jobs, but omitted consideration of the millions still on relief\textsuperscript{62} whose absorption Roosevelt had declared.

\textsuperscript{62}The President's message to Congress on Appropriations for unemployment relief, March 18, 1936, declared that in spite of gains in employment since 1933, "there are at present approximately 5,300,000 families and unattached persons on the works program and 1,500,000 on local and State relief rolls. Every thinking person knows that this problem of unemployment is the most difficult one before the country." Urging industry to accept the problem of reemployment, he stated, "Federal assistance which arose as a result of industrial disemployment can be terminated if industry itself removes the underlying conditions." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, pp. 126, 130.

as industry's duty. The narrow statement that the President made at this point could not be denied as it stood but reflected only a small portion of his expressed beliefs on the problem of employment.

It was true that industrial earnings were the highest in seven years\textsuperscript{63} and that commercial failures

\textsuperscript{63}The gross income of corporations dropped from 36 billion in 1930 to 81 billion in 1932 but had risen to 132 billion again in 1936. Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1938, p. 198, and for 1940, p. 195.

had decreased,\textsuperscript{64} but the government's relation to these

\textsuperscript{64}Of the number of concerns in business in 1933, 1.04% failed in 1933; of the number in business in 1936, only .45% failed. Statistical Abstract of the United
improvements was declared without proof.

However, in the case of the railroads, Roosevelt stated that the increase of freight loadings and the receipt of passenger receipts were due to the government's action on rates. This assignment of a complex result to a single cause is indefensible not only from the point of view of other causes, such as regulation of the holding companies, but also from the general picture of an interacting recovery which Roosevelt had been trying to present.

Roosevelt pointed to "a steadier supply, a
steadier demand and steadier prices" of farm products as a real benefit to the middlemen; he declared that the government was trying to maintain those conditions.68

68Roosevelt's speech was given on October 14, before the retail price changes resulting from the drought had become widely noticeable. B. W. Snow, Chicago business analyst, predicted in August that the price changes would not occur for several months. (New York Times, August 2, 1936) It should be noted that ten times as much butter was imported in August of 1936 as in the same month of the previous year, and that the higher prices on manufactured dairy products was being followed by advances in milk prices with more than 50 cities reporting price increases effective in August, 1936. The Agricultural Situation, 20, No. 9: 9, September 1, 1936, "Drought Taking Heavy Toll of Dairy Products, L. M. Davis.

That the administration was attempting to stabilize the farmers' conditions was true, but its possibility of success without attendant unsatisfactory results was greatly in question.69 It should be remembered that

69Senator Dickinson of Iowa declared: "The folly of buying produce from one State to replenish the drought-threatened stores of another, limited in its production by governmental edict is just one of the ridiculous features of the New Deal that is beginning to be apparent to voters throughout this area." New York Times, July 8, 1936.

the only important difference between Republican and Democratic promises on agriculture in this campaign was that the Republicans added the idea of tariff-equivalent payments.
The President closed this dynamic specification of the government's efforts and achievements with a definite falling inflection which centered attention on the words "trying to keep it that way."

**Recovery does not just "happen"**

Refutation of the opponents' charge that this recovery was not due to the government's efforts is set in humorous proximity to this detailed recital. Roosevelt's argument that recovery does not "just happen" because it did not from 1929 to 1933 is fallacious through the factor of time that it ignores. The processes of liquidation and adjustment, of accumulation of new capital reserves, of reorganization take unspecified periods of time and are of gradual accomplishment. It is impossible to specify a definite turn from depression to recovery.

---

70Opponents of the New Deal place the turn before Roosevelt's inauguration, as William S. Myers and Walter Newton have stated: "The bottom of the depression was reached in July, 1932, and the United States with other parts of the world, was on the upgrade prior to election." (Saturday Evening Post, 207: 5, June 8, 1935.) On the other hand, Louis M. Hacker and Benjamin Kendrick point to the indices of March, 1933, to support their statement that the depression "in the spring of 1933, touched the lowest point experienced in recent capitalist history." The United States Since 1865, F. S. Crofts & Co., New York, 1939, p. 672.

for the seeds of the improvement develop within the
depression and the point at which the gains may be regarded as permanent is difficult to assess. A further weakness in this argument lies in the subordinated idea that during those years "we waited for recovery just to happen." He had not so judged the Hoover administration in his Inaugural Address of March 4, 1933, for he had said,

True they have tried, but their efforts have been cast in the pattern of an outworn tradition."

Hence, this argument is fallacious both through an unsound supporting contention and through inconsistency with his previously declared position.

Of comparable length is the alternative statement of his administration's activities. The underlying basis of the comparison which he developed through the speech is stated in these brief opening remarks: that the Republican government refused its responsibility and did
nothing; that the Democratic government accepted the responsibility and acted to the benefit of private enterprise. The tacit assumption underlying the comparison is that the government has the responsibility of bringing recovery. Roosevelt's swift actions to end depression have met the objection that they prevented the operation of forces basic to real recovery. 73

73 Roger Babson pointed out that this recovery would be accompanied by a shortage in "those fundamental characteristics of integrity, industry and thrift which have made America.... Apparently there will be a shortage in these crops for some time because Dr. Roosevelt has so doped the American people during the past few years that we have not learned the lessons which a depression usually teaches." Washington Post, September 16, 1936.

Republican administration did not bring recovery

Roosevelt strengthened his accusation of Republican failure by a pointed rhetorical question in transition and continued the colloquial question-and-answer interchange to point up strongly his charge that the Republican administration had been "high-finance-minded." Reinterpretation of the term "high finance" to omit the great majority of business men and to include only those who speculate with other people's money and distrust popular government was strong motivational appeal to a group whose livelihood was largely
earned in the business world. Explanation that Theodore Roosevelt had also distinguished between big and small business helped concentrate the attack upon monopolists. Emphasis upon the good citizenship of the majority of business men was implicit refutation of the charge that Roosevelt was inciting class against class.

This small group of speculators, Roosevelt declared, wanted government aid to "trickle down from the top" and wanted no competition of government loans to small corporations or individuals and no government supervision over exchanges.\(^{74}\) It was indeed true that

\(^{74}\) "It was not stretching the facts too far to say that a few dominant finance-capitalist groups--among which the Morgan and Rockefeller groups were the leaders--were controlling the destinies of a great part of the country's business life." Hacker, op. cit., p. 180.

Secretary Mellon had been frequently criticized for keeping the interest rates on government bonds too high and that strong agitation for refunding the Federal debt at decreased rates accomplished nothing in the Hoover administration.\(^{75}\) The President was referring,\(^{75}\)


doubtless, to such Republican capitalists as Walter P.
Chrysler, Charles M. Schwab and Percy A. Rockefeller, whose participation in a pool, organized on March 4, 1929, to gamble in radio common stock, had netted them thousands of dollars of profits. 76 He was referring

76 The Nation, 134:609, June 1, 1932.

to such transactions as that of the Goldman Sachs Trading Corporation with the Federal Foods Corporation, a deal which lost the public ninety million dollars. 77 He was

77 Ibid.

referring to capitalists like Harry M. Warner of Warner Brothers who admitted to the Senate Investigating Committee that he had made seven million dollars by gambling in the stocks of his company but refused to admit that his transactions were in any way unethical. 78 President

78 Ibid.

Whitney of the New York Stock Exchange described his institution to the Senate Investigating Committee as "benevolent" but the investigators obtained information too significant to be stopped "even by Rockefellers,
That such capitalists fought government supervision of exchanges was natural indeed.

That the Republican administration stood on the side of the money interests was exemplified in Hoover's request to Congress to establish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend Federal money to key enterprises and his veto of the Wagner-Garner Relief Bill, which would have extended the loans to small businesses and individuals. With Secretary Mellon keeping interest rates high and Secretary Mills standing against high taxation of large incomes, the Republican Administration deserved the charge of being too closely involved with the big moneyed interests for the people's welfare.

Roosevelt's use of graphic language, "the government, in those days, hypnotized by its indebtedness to them, stood by and let the depression drive industry and business toward bankruptcy," summarized his condemnation of the Republican handling.

The President further impressed the need of
Federal action by analogy with the interstate action of kidnappers and bank robbers, holding that interstate monopolies needed national action just as the other interstate activities had. On the basis of the pro-


tection of business from such "selfish forces" Roosevelt turned to the record and promises of his administration.

Democratic administration saved business

Roosevelt's declaration of dedication to the "greater good of the greater number" in terms of a sign upon a desk was effective through its image-creating power and also through the ethical appeal of Government at a desk, a powerful implication in a year when the point at issue was widely recognized as being that of Roosevelt himself. Further power was provided for the specification of the administration's record by the reminder of two conditions—previous failure of Republican government and private enterprise to bring recovery, and the absence of scandal under conditions requiring
speed and involving complexities and much money. 82

82 Teapot Dome is a catch phrase typifying graft in government circles. None of the individuals involved in this suit over the lease of Naval Oil Reserves in Wyoming was convicted by the Supreme Court, but the newspapers of the country had found three of the principals guilty and were displeased with the court verdict. Dictionary of American History, Vol. V, p. 234, "Teapot Dome Oil Scandal," T. T. Read.

This reference to the Teapot Dome scandal under Republican leadership was indirect refutation of the charges that relief funds had been squandered in various instances by the New Deal and of Landon's declaration of relief without waste. 83

83 Landon had stated in Buffalo, New York, on August 26, 1936, that "The Republican party believes in being generous in the spending of money for relief and emergency purposes, but it believes that these funds should be spent without waste and absurdities." Vital Speeches, 2: 764, September 15, 1936, "Federal and Family Finances."

Roosevelt's analogy of business recovery with the resetting of a derailed train upon the tracks was compelling before an audience in the rail center of a state second only to Texas in its mileage. 84

The President's third step—after setting the conditions and establishing the analogy—in setting the stage for a vigorous recital of his administration's achievements was the listing of the needs of business in 1933 as though they were requests from business to the Federal Government. His declaration that there were "five things" that "the average business man wanted government to do for him" established a framework which centered attention upon them in turn. He followed each of the five with a triumphant claim, "and we did it!" 85

The stress pattern of these repetitions changed: at first the word "did" was given prominence by heightened pitch; later, as the idea of accomplishment seems to be established, the pitch emphasis decreased until in the last phase the words change to a more conclusive form, "and we've done it!"

A short, crisp rhetorical question forms the transition to the awaited answer. First: "stop deflation and falling prices." Roosevelt gave three means of accomplishment: by a sound monetary policy; 86 by bank reorganiza-

85 This contention was denied by ex-President Hoover at the Republican Convention, June 10, 1936, when he spoke of "unstable currencies." (Vital Speeches, 2: 572, June 15, 1936, "A Holy Crusade for Liberty.") On the other hand, David Warburg returned his support to Roosevelt because of his work on stabilization and reciprocal treaties. (New York Times, October 18, 1936.) This phrase, "a sound monetary policy," could be assessed
if it meant dollar devaluation, or gold purchase, or relief spending; since it includes all these, and others, it amounts to blanket approval of the Roosevelt program; by its inclusiveness it is illogical.

87 These were both undeniable accomplishments of the New Deal.

88 This was the underlying thought of the National Recovery Administration with its voluntary signing of Codes of Fair Practices. The code-making provisions were declared invalid by the Supreme Court on May 27, 1935, in a New York poultry case on two grounds: that code-making power was an invalid extension of legislative power, and that this case did not constitute interstate commerce. Thus, for the first two years of Roosevelt's administration, industry proceeded on the basis of codes, without any definition of fundamental principles or codes until the work of the Policy Board was begun on May 9, 1934. The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. III, p. 132.

Thus, one of his arguments is too general to be accepted as proof, another is valid, and the third was declared unconstitutional.

The second need of business was to "increase the purchasing power of...the industrial workers."

Roosevelt pointed to the PWA, the WPA, the RFC, the Federal housing programs, loans to municipalities, and
the CCC camps as having put millions of dollars into circulation. His interpretation of the value of

Federal expenditures on these activities were not denied by Roosevelt's opponents. What they declared was that these expenditures had been made with political considerations in mind and with waste. Landon condemned the extent and nature of the spending: "Today, the administration is spending money for almost every conceivable thing. It is spending even for the necessary things in ways we cannot afford—in reckless ways which are beyond our means..." Vital Speeches, 2: 762, September 15, 1936, "Federal and Family Finances".

work for the unemployed as measured only in terms of "the preservation of the families of America" made the same type of appeal as had Landon's insistence that the Republicans were interested in the maintenance of family-type farms.

Roosevelt declared that the third need of business men in 1933 was for an increase in the purchasing power of his farmer customers. He listed the Triple A, the cattle-buying program, the drought and flood relief programs, and the Farm Credit Administration as the agencies through which the farmers' income was increased. That these activities poured Federal
funds into the farmers' pockets is not to be denied.91

91 The Triple A was invalidated by the Supreme Court on January 6, 1936, with the explanation that the act was essentially one of regulation of agricultural production, a matter of intrastate activity, and not one of "general welfare" as the New Deal government had contended. The Public Papers and Address of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. IV, p. 10.

The whole question of full production versus scarcity was at issue in the campaign. The Republicans made the charge as Republican Chairman Hamilton said at the Headquarters on July 7, 1936: "If we hadn't had crop curtailment, the food scarcity that threatens us in the Fall certainly would not be present in the degree it is now." New York Times, July 8, 1936.

The President's fourth request from business men was that of decreasing interest, power and transportation rates. He referred to "a sounder and cheaper money market and a sound banking and securities system" as steps in decreasing interest rates.92 He offered

92 By the authority of the Thomas Amendment and the Banking Act of 1935, the Federal Reserve Banks had been purchasing government securities in order to expand the credit facilities of the member banks. In other words, they continued to pursue a cheap money policy up to late 1936....In August, 1936, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System raised the reserve requirements by 50%. Hacker, op. cit., p. 241.

The Federal Securities Act of May 27, 1933, freed new issues of securities from misleading sales propaganda by requiring their registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission. (Ibid.) The sensational disclosures of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency had forcefully made clear the need for drastic change in the operation of security exchanges and commercial banks. Ibid., p. 239.
no example of the encouragement of cheap power; however, the creation of a "yardstick" against which the rates and practices of private utilities could be measured was the expressed purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Also the Public Utility Act of 1935 sought to break the power of holding companies by requiring registration with the Securities Exchange Commission. The President's declaration of having afforded the business man cheaper transportation rates was unsupported at this point.

The fifth "thing" which the business man wanted Government to do for him was to protect him from losses "due to crime, bank robbers, kidnappers, and blackmailers." No elaboration of this point is given in the address. Rather, the President turned to the Government's chief attempt--to "break the deadly grip" of monopoly. Jefferson's warning against the existence of poverty and concentrated wealth in a democracy was invoked as a background of historical precedent for the attack on the growth of concentrated economic power.

Throughout this exposition of the government's aid to business Roosevelt had used his power of clear explanation, as "You business men know how much legitimate business you lost in the old days because your customers were robbed by fake securities or impoverished by shaky banks." His visualization of process was well
demonstrated in the illustration of how "money began to go round again."

Concentration stifled private enterprise

Roosevelt's opening claim that the concentration of economic power had been "insidiously growing up among us in the last fifty years" was justified by the fact that in 1870 the wage-and-salaried workers made up about one-half of the working population; in 1935, about four-fifths.93


Small enterprises were being crowded out.94 Leadership in business policies came to be concentrated in the hands of finance;95 for example, nearly one-fourth of American corporate wealth was within the Morgan sphere of
influence. Roosevelt's argument that such control of the money markets eliminated competition and starved out the independent business man was directly in line with Woodrow Wilson's thinking.

In June, 1911, Woodrow Wilson stated that "the dangerously concentrated control of credit in this country has destroyed economic freedom. Further, a great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit and the credit system in the United States is concentrated in a great money monopoly." Ray S. Baker, Woodrow Wilson, Life and Letters, Doubleday, Doran & Co., Garden City, New York, 1931, Vol. IV, p. 136.

Democratic administration is not antagonistic to business. Roosevelt's emphatic declaration of belief in private enterprise as the "backbone of economic well-being" prefaced a rejection of concentration as true "private enterprise" and characterization of it as "regimentation of other people's money and other people's lives." Also Roosevelt sought to dispel the Republican

These terms are reminiscent of the Philadelphia address of June 27, 1936, in which he had flayed the "economic royalists." At that time he declared that they "sought to regiment the people, their labor and their property." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V., p. 232.
allegation of Democratic antagonism to business by labeling the stories as fairy tales\textsuperscript{99} and pointing to

\textsuperscript{99}Roosevelt referred to his statement about bogeymen and fairy tales in Kansas: "They have tried, I am sorry to say, to spread the gospel of fear not only in the factories, which is an old outworn trick, but this year they are even trying to bring fear into the homes and firesides of America." (Ibid., p. 459) Three days before the Wichita address, which is quoted above, Roosevelt had said in extemporaneous remarks from the rear-platform at Pacific Junction, Iowa, "We got a telegram on the train this morning from a certain section of the country that there are a lot of people going around to people's homes saying that, if I get reelected, the debt of the United States is going to be liquidated by levying a tax on everybody's home and farm in the United States." Ibid., p. 426.

A serious statement of the fears of business men relative to the Democratic administration was made before the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce on October 19, 1936, by C. M. Chester, president of the National Association of Manufacturers when he declared that business men "detect in proposed legislation trends toward regimentation and the hampering of individual enterprise; and that they are seriously and properly alarmed by doctrines which run counter to our practical experience, and which would seem to challenge the whole theory of private enterprise commonly known as the American System." Vital Speeches, 3: 58, November 1, 1936, "The Great Highway."

the record which had saved the system of private enterprise. Roosevelt pointed to the advance in private business during his administration as proof of his support. Whether his listeners interpreted this example as giving the whole credit for recovery to the administration or as showing that government restraints were
not too heavy, they would agree that it refuted the idea of governmental "antagonism" to business to some extent. Reiteration of the improvement for "the banker, the storekeeper, the small factory owner, the industrialist" during the last seven years was made graphic for these business people by couching it in terms of a pleasant look at their ledgers. Roosevelt's declaration

100 On July 25, 1935, reports from the United States Chamber of Commerce were made public, declaring, "Unless influences outside the normal operations of business processes intervene, the course of 1935 may show this as the best year in physical volume of business since 1929..." New York Times, July 26, 1935.

in deliberate tones that "Some of these people really forget how sick they were. But I know how sick they were," was the same humorous charge of ingratitude as in his story of the lost silk hat in his Syracuse address. The analogy of economic illness with physical illness lay in the urgent, fearful request for help, the desire for temporary relief and permanent treatment with speed, restoration to health of most and the consequent ingratitude of some. Choice of words for development of the story of recovery added humor, as "the knees of all of our rugged individualists were trembling," "these distinguished patients," "throw their crutches at the doctor."
Roosevelt's declaration of belief in individualism "up to the point where the individualist starts to operate at the expense of society" is a clear statement of liberty under a democratic form of government. That the great majority of American business men would have agreed with his stand and that they, with the nation, had suffered when the point had been overstepped—were patently true.

The President's further proof to business that they need not fear the future stems from his contention that the Federal debt was lower in proportion to national income than in 1933. 101 That expenditures were declining

101 The President was speaking of net debt; hence, he doubtless meant to continue subtracting the six billion dollars worth of assets upon which he had insisted in the Pittsburgh address. However, even using the gross debt figures, his calculation is borne out by the amounts given in The Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1937, p. 297, and for 1936, p. 200. The gross public debt of June 30, 1933, was $22,538,672,000 and for June 30, 1936, $33,778,543,000; the national income produced in 1933 was $41,813,000,000, and in 1936, $63,799,000,000.

and income increasing he had established in his Pittsburgh address on the budget, October 1, 1936. Thus, with an administration record showing private enterprise making gains, with a governmental attitude favoring a rightful degree of individualism, and a solvent government
as a basis, Roosevelt sought to conclude that business might be confident in his administration's future relationship to business. This argument of consistency of approach would have been strong in the mouth of a man who believed government to be the establishment of known policies but was not convincing in the mouth of a man who believed in broad, general objectives and pursued a policy of experimentation to attain them.  

102 There is an echo of Wilsonian statement in Roosevelt's summary: "The people of America have no quarrel with business. They insist only that the power of concentrated wealth shall not be abused." Ethical appeal is strong in the interchange of the "people of America" for his administration in the declaration of relationships with business.

Roosevelt's choice of this period of the campaign in which to make his overture to business was well calculated in that the "slide" had begun and it was

103 Farley pointed out that private reports a few
weeks before polling day made it clear to those experienced in politics that a "slide" was on. Behind the Gallgate Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1936, pp. 322-323.

natural for all groups to begin to make adjustments as they saw affairs begin to take shape.

All citizens are joined to preserve old ideals

Roosevelt's conclusion dignified the issue under discussion by declaring it a part of America's struggle to preserve democracy, a fight which had been lost in other parts of the world.104 He further

104 This use of pathetic appeal parallels that in the conclusion of the Philadelphia acceptance address of June 27, 1936, in which he had attacked the "economic royalists."

strengthened his contention that there was no division between the business men and other Americans by declaring them specifically united in "a firm resolve to hold the fruits of that victory."105 The old "ideals" and

105 W. L. Clayton, president of Anderson, Clayton & Co., Cotton-buyers, before Harvard Business School Association, September 16, 1936, declared that two things are necessary for the preservation of the American economic system: "the great majority of the American people must be made to understand the system, and its abuses must be recognized and substantially corrected. This accomplished, there is no doubt that our capitalism of the future will be of a nature to preserve and develop
further that individual initiative, courage, and instinct for cultural and material progress which have made our country great." Vital Speeches, 2: 811, October 1, 1936, "The Future of Capitalism."

"fundamentals" to which Roosevelt declared all citizens are resolved to cling were doubtless the constitutional rights of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness, as he had explained in the Philadelphia address.106 This

106 There he had defined liberty: "Liberty requires opportunity to make a living—a living decent according to the standard of the time, a living which gives man not only enough to live by, but something to live for." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 233.

interpretation of economic stability in human terms was refutation of Hoover's charge in his address to the Republican National Convention on June 10, 1936, when he had declared:

The social order does not rest upon orderly economic freedom alone. It rests even more upon the ideals and character of a people... Fundamental American liberties are at stake. Stop the retreat, and turning the eyes of your fellow Americans to the sunlight of freedom, lead the attack to retake, recapture and retain the citadels of liberty.107


Pathetic appeal was strong in the identification of all
citizens in their present activities with the preservation of venerated ideals.

Summary and Interpretation

Roosevelt, swinging eastward on his speaking tour through the "doubtful" MidWest states, delivered a powerful and politically astute address in the Chicago Stadium on October 14, 1936. Welcomed in this business-minded city by 125,000 labor and ward marchers as well as by throngs on every street, and by laudatory speeches of introduction, Roosevelt assured the business men that their welfare had been the care of the Federal government and that they were, indeed, integral parts of the national structure.

The President had been told repeatedly on this MidWest tour by state leaders and candidates that his chief opposition in this area came from small and medium-size business men. Furthermore, Roosevelt's experienced political advisers, as well as his own observations, indicated to him, however, that the "slide" to Democratic standards had begun; hence, the time was ripe for an overture to small business men, who would now be considering readjustments to align themselves with the party which was to be victorious.
Roosevelt's hold on the non-Chicago sections of Illinois was questionable; his greatest strength lay in Chicago itself, and his chance of winning the state's electoral votes depended largely on the size of the vote he won there.

Consequently, Roosevelt's address in Chicago solicited the support of business men there and throughout the country, and sought to win enough city votes to give him the electoral votes of Illinois.

Ideas and logical proofs

Roosevelt attempted to show the business men that his administration had brought them recovery, that it neither had been, nor would be, antagonistic to their welfare.

That his administration had brought business benefits he proved effectively by listing six groups of men and by giving a statement statistically reliable of the benefit from Democratic government to each. In order to show that these benefits had resulted from his policies, Roosevelt argued that their failure to occur from 1929 to 1932 proved that they did not "just happen," a fallacious oversimplification through its neglect of the time factor necessary in business reorganization.
Just as in his budget address at Pittsburgh, as in his speech at Syracuse analyzing Communistic trends in the United States, and in his farm speech in Omaha, he again strengthened his case for Democratic leadership by setting its achievements in contrast with the alleged failures of Republican administration. He asserted, without proofs, that "high finance" had influenced the Republican administration to limit its loans and subsidies to them and to refrain from reducing interest rates or supervising financial exchanges; in these ways the monopolies had been "stifling" private enterprise under his opponents' leadership.

Roosevelt developed his explanation of Democratic action for business as steps taken to answer the five needs of business men in 1933. Again he listed the agencies and policies by which deflation had been stopped; purchasing power increased; interest, power and transportation rates decreased; protection from crime afforded. Although he failed to consider the full implication of the programs listed, such as the fact that the AAA and the NRA had been invalidated, yet the total picture of the record of his administration was forceful support of his declaration that it was not antagonistic to business. He carefully differentiated between speculators and the
majority of business men in his attack on monopoly.

Roosevelt's explanation of his own attitude of favoring individualism except at the expense of society was consistent with basic American policy and, also, comforting to those engaged in private enterprise. He had used his record of activity on behalf of business, in contrast to Republican favoritism to monopolists, to reassure the business men of his continuing interest in their welfare.

Ethical proofs

The basic ethical appeal in this address lay in the detailed explanation of the ways in which Roosevelt's actions had brought benefits to business. This reputation of having "hauled" the train of business from the ditch and of having started it to run more smoothly was effective ethical proof for those who could not deny having received the enumerated benefits.

Roosevelt showed himself a person of discrimination by his differentiation of speculators and other business men. But, of most importance in augmenting his stature in the eyes of this audience was the fact that his explanations of the record had demonstrated that all the activities of his administration—from flood relief
to the Federal Housing program—had reacted to the benefit of business. This was compelling argument that he was a good leader for business to depend upon.

And Roosevelt solicited the good will of his audience by reference to Chicago's gallantry in the fight against the depression, by requesting the different forms of business to render government credit due for specific benefits received, and by characterizing the ingratitude of ones withholding such credit as patients who "throw their crutches at the doctor."

With the exception of the opening salute to Chicago, all ethical proofs in this address sprang from the analysis of the Democratic government's achievements for business.

Pathetic proofs

Basic to this whole address was the thesis that Democratic government had rescued private business from the plight into which the Republican administration had allowed it to fall. No stronger pathetic proof could have been afforded an audience whose livelihood depended upon conditions conducive to good business. Hence, all individual evidences of pathetic proof, except the compliments to Chicago in the introduction, were subordinate
to this basic proof which was woven into the fabric of the whole address.

Such subordinate proofs included the explanation that the "overwhelming majority of business men" were good citizens, and the contention that they, also, did not believe in individualism at the expense of society—both proofs appealing to the need for recognition.

**Arrangement**

The arrangement of this address was a powerful factor in its total effectiveness. Establishing first that the Roosevelt administration had brought benefits to all classes of business people, the speaker removed the possible explanation that Democratic government was a coincident but not a causal factor in recovery, designated the conditions under Republican administration which prevented recovery, and returned to the argument that Democratic government had saved business.

This procedure of listing specific benefits to business first secured a measure of belief from which the President proceeded. By showing that Republican policies, directly contrary to his, had failed, he strengthened the presentation of his successful policies. Thus he moved from the audience's acceptance of specific benefits to
business to the general conclusion that all his national policies had worked together for the good of business. To the development of this final argument he devoted most of his attention.

Notable was his insistence that business had had no part in recovery. Although recognition of any achievement toward recovery by business itself would have added to the good will of the audience, yet it would have weakened industry's reliance upon his administration and consequently would have been inconsistent with the thesis of his address.

Thus, not only the ordering but the selection of ideas played an unusually large part in the effectiveness of this speech.

Language

Concrete words, colloquial phraseology, and word pictures, characteristic of Roosevelt's language, were present in this address in about the same degree as in the Omaha and Pittsburgh addresses. The extended comparison of ungrateful business to hospital patients not thankful for their recovery was similar in word-choice and phrasing to the comparison of big business to the "nice old gentleman wearing a silk hat" in the Syracuse
This speech did not depend to the same extent upon balanced structure within sentences as did the Philadelphia and Madison Square Garden addresses; however, it did rely, for the cumulative picturization of the actions taken for recovery, upon a framework set up and the specific sections carefully differentiated, as did also the Omaha and Worcester speeches.

Roosevelt's address to business used a significant metaphor to illustrate the principal thesis, that of the rescue and repair of a derailed train; for a similar purpose he had used the baseball analogy in the Pittsburgh address and the changing car model comparison in the agriculture speech in Omaha.

There was little dependence in this address upon quotations from well-known persons (the reference to Theodore Roosevelt was subordinate) and no reliance upon scriptural turns of expression; thus, the address contrasted sharply in these respects to the Madison Square Garden and the Philadelphia addresses.

On the whole, the language of this speech played a distinctly important part with its concreteness and vigor in the effectiveness of the whole.
**Delivery**

Roosevelt used a conversational mode, with its characteristic rapid changes of rate, through the major part of this address. He distinctly gave the impression, through use of slower rate and more upward inflection, of reasoning through these problems with his auditors. None of that colloquial, informal utterance had appeared in the Philadelphia address, in contrast. Alteration of the aspects of voice aided in the portrayal of attitudes of pride, conviction, firmness, irony. His utterance of repeated phrases had sufficient variety of vocal stress to maintain interest and to gain cumulative effect; this usage corresponded closely to that of the refrain in the Worcester address to impress the audience with the idea that Roosevelt's changes had "Americanized" the tax structure.

The most outstanding characteristic of the delivery of this address was its vigorous utterance.

Thus Roosevelt, in his overture to small business, presented his administration's acts in its behalf in several ways, rendered his recital vivid by illustration and graphic word-choice, made it acceptable by reassessing the position of the business man in the citizenry of America. The power of the address was
attested by its appraisal in the newspapers of the country, for even disaffected critics admitted its effectiveness; furthermore, on November third, Chicago voted for Roosevelt.

Reactions to the Speech

The "frequent storms of applause," which punctuated the address were duplicated in the newspaper accounts of the effectiveness of the speech. The

"It was a speech of enthralling statesmanship. It was a message of simplicity and clarity. It was a feat of oratory which left the nerves tingling. Never did the President of the United States stand out more superbly as the leader of this great people—a leader by virtue of the high quality of his leadership." New York Post, October 16, 1936.

"The most effective and vote-getting speech thus far made by the President.... Even those who challenge some of the economic reasoning in it must admit that it was a fine example of the political art. One can hardly imagine anything more skilfully fitted to time and place." New York Times, October 16, 1936.

"Standing in the same auditorium where he accepted his party's nomination four years ago, Franklin Roosevelt made his strongest bid for the support of the small business man. In finest fettle, he mingled humorous sallies, sharp arguments, and suave assurance that he was innately conservative." News-Week, 8: 14, October 24, 1936, "Campaign: Nominees Refute Each Other...."
Arthur Evans pointed out that Roosevelt spoke "before a demonstrative audience of 25,000," and declared that this "address which was regarded as perhaps the most important in the President's campaign so far was punctuated from time to time by bursts of applause." Making no comment on the delivery or composition of the address, he stated that it had failed to answer the questions of Landon's Detroit speech, asking whether Roosevelt intended the return of the NRA and AAA. (Chicago Daily Tribune, October 15, 1936.) This newspaper used as its editorial comment on the address three paragraphs on balancing the budget as the foundation for recovery, quoted directly from Roosevelt's speech of October 19, 1932, at Pittsburgh, Ibid.

Main challenges of the speech were to its sincerity.110

110 Mark Sullivan pointed to Roosevelt's "immense capacity for sincerity about the thing he happens to wish to believe at the time" and cited the Chicago speech placating business as an example. (New York Herald Tribune, October 20, 1936.) Governor Landon answered Roosevelt's Chicago assurances to businessmen in a speech, at Danville, Illinois, saying: "The President is giving lip service to our system of free enterprise, while spokesmen for his administration...advocate the doctrine of scarcity, of regimentation....If Mr. Roosevelt really is sincere...let him...repudiate those who speak for his administration." News-Week, 8: 14, October 24, 1936, "Campaign: Nominees Refute each other..."

"The question is, to what extent do such encouraging assurances outweigh Mr. Roosevelt's persistent refusal to specify even the general direction which his policy would follow in the event of reelection..." Washington Post, October 16, 1936.

As to its interpretation of the facts in the situation,111

111 "It is interesting to note that the credit for business recovery, in the opinion of the President, belongs not to business but to Government...And while many of the President's metaphors last night were amusing and
most effectively used, his hearers must have been left somewhat puzzled by his version of some of the facts."

e.g. high finance refusing credit to the industrialist, the business man, etc. Washington Star, October 15, 1936.

and as to the issues which the President omitted.\(^{112}\)

\(^{112}\) It is to be remembered that Governor Landon, speaking at Detroit the previous evening, had directly asked the President this question: "Does the administration plan to re-enact the NRA?" (New York Times, October 14, 1936.) Editorial comment pointed out that this was a fair question, the answer to which would have been of interest to many voters. (Ibid., October 15, 1936.) "The Chicago speech, like all those delivered by the President in this campaign to date, is less remarkable for what it says than for what it omits.... At Chicago he indicated a dawning appreciation of the fact that quite a few who can scarcely be called economic royalists are considering voting against him on November 5." Washington Post, October 16, 1936.

There was some feeling that Roosevelt's reassurances to business had dispelled fears,\(^{113}\) and persons close to the

\(^{113}\) "By his frank and bold utterance Mr. Roosevelt went far to dispel certain fears that his course and conduct, together with the apparent tendencies of his party, had engendered." New York Times, October 16, 1936.

President predicted that he would carry Michigan and Illinois as a result of his work there in the last thirty-six hours.\(^{114}\) Reactions in Illinois showed that

\(^{114}\) Ibid., October 17, 1936, Charles W. Hurd.
the farmers were likely to vote Republican but George

Patrick Nash admitted that the farmers were returning to the Republican party and that little support for the Democratic ticket could be expected from the outlying counties. Senator J. Hamilton Lewis pointed out that the farmers were afraid of increased taxes and that "many of them, despite the aid afforded by the administration, are turning back to the Republican party." New York Times, October 16, 1936.

Harding, Republican National Committeeman, admitted that the presence of Roosevelt in Illinois had "solidified the Democratic vote." As to labor, ward workers reported

that the latest surveys showed that organized labor was 95% Democratic. Turner Catledge pointed out that the

President's recent speeches in the Central Western territory are reflected by political realignments in the last week; by the attitude at headquarters of the two parties in each State; by the Democrat's new "pep" and by the expressions of the voters themselves as they gather about the towns to trade.

Officials on the President's train declared that reports on the reactions to the President's western trip indicated an "even greater public support than in 1932."
Hence, it seems that Roosevelt's Chicago address showed him a clever campaigner in his relationship to the crowds, in his selection of issues to discuss, in his deftness in discriminating between "the overwhelming majority of business men" and the monopolists, in his encouragement to the business group to consider itself an integral part of the economic structure.
Chapter VI

THE ADDRESS AT THE MUNICIPAL AUDITORIUM,
WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS, OCTOBER 21, 1936

The Background

American bankers were rejoicing in mid-October over the new monetary agreement with Britain and France.¹


This common decision to avoid competitive devaluation of their currencies and to use stabilization funds to prevent fluctuations in the value of their own currency definitely ended the period during which America could be said to be threatening foreign economies by her devaluation policy.²

²Rauch, op. cit., p. 248.

Domestic financial policies also were much in discussion at this time in the United States. On October 17, 1936, Senator Vandenberg presented over the Columbia Broadcasting System a "fireside mystery chat," in which he used recordings of Roosevelt's voice in answer to his own questions on expenditures; this unprecedented program³

³For eighteen minutes Senator Vandenberg ridiculed the
answers selected from Roosevelt's earlier speeches; the broadcasting company interrupted the program, undecided whether to allow this use of transcriptions to continue, with the result that some stations cut off the program whereas others allowed it to continue. *News-Week*, 8:16, October 24, 1936, "Debate: Senator Vandenberg Combats Recorded Voice and CBS."

pointed the thinking of its hearers to questions of governmental spending. And Secretary Morgenthau took up the same question when he answered Herbert Hoover's bitter arraignment of the financial record of the New Deal; the Secretary declared that facts did not bear out the ex-President's charges and that every change made by the present administration has been in the direction of greater clarity and completeness in reporting the receipts and expenditures of public funds.

It should be recalled that the Republican Administration had used a similar method of deducting excess credits over debits from the actual expenditures during the liquidation of the War Finance Corporation.
Another question continued to appear in mid-October. Republican vice-presidential candidate Knox demanded an answer from the President on his intentions of reviving the National Recovery Administration; Republicans capitalized on a statement by James Roosevelt at a Democratic rally regarding the carrying out of the principles of the Act, with a statement from Landon, "The silence of the father will be the confession that the son spoke for the President." The whole question of bringing back the

N. R. A. and the A. A. A. was asked pointedly by Governor Landon in his address of October 13 at Detroit: "Does the administration plan to re-enact the NRA? Does it intend to return to the control of food products at Washington?"

6 Ibid., October 19, 1936.


8 James Roosevelt answered by issuing a transcript of his remarks: "The administration is pledged to attempt to carry out the purposes of the National Recovery Administration in every constitutional manner. Should there be no way... I, as an individual, see no alternative but to ask the people for the right to make those purposes constitutional." Newsweek, 8:17, October 24, 1936, "Campaign Notes."
In addition to these questions of policy, strikes were bringing the matter of wages and hours to the attention of the public.\(^9\)

Roosevelt appeared at Rochester, New York, on October 17, 1936, to make a minor campaign address in the midst of a strike of some 2000 WPA workers. Rochester Journal, October 17, 1936.

The two major presidential candidates were touring the country in opposite directions, Landon turning to the West coast while Roosevelt toured the East. Landon was emphasizing the continued problem of unemployment, left unsolved by the Democratic administration, and the abuse of the powers of government.\(^10\) Roosevelt was returning


\(^10\)Roosevelt appeared at Rochester, New York, on October 17, 1936, to make a minor campaign address in the midst of a strike of some 2000 WPA workers.

\(^11\)In Cleveland, Ohio, on October 12, 1936, he spoke also of the relief problem (New York Times, October 13, 1936); at Detroit the following day he pointed out that the automobile industry had "led the way back from depression" and struck at increased presidential power (Ibid., October 14, 1936); at Danville, Illinois, on October 15, he refuted Roosevelt's Chicago address, challenging a policy of scarcity and regimentation (Ibid., October 16, 1936); he returned to the problem of agriculture and foreign trade in Albuquerque, New Mexico, on October 19, (Ibid., October 20, 1936); at Los Angeles, California, he charged the Democratic administration with undermining fundamental liberties, criticized the use of relief funds and indicted the Roosevelt administration for its Congressional investigations (Ibid., October 21, 1936).
eastward from his swing to Omaha and Denver, praising WPA projects, emphasizing recovery and the interdependent economic structure of the country. Landon was booed by

12 At Detroit, Michigan, where the President was expected to receive a large majority although the farm areas were conceded to be Republican territory (Detroit News, October 15, 1936), he stated that history would show the main issue of the campaign to have been, "Shall the social and economic security and betterment of the masses of the American people be maintained and strengthened or not?" (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 499) A rainbow arched across the sky in Cleveland an hour before the President's arrival to address the rain-soaked crowd. (Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 17, 1936, Roselif Loveland) The President gave the figures of recovery, and reiterated his Chicago assurances to business men. (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, pp. 502-506) Speaking first in his home state at Rochester, New York, the President pointed out that New York State had led the way to care of the unemployed and to understanding of agricultural and industrial interdependence. Ibid., p. 512.

WPA workers and others in Los Angeles; Roosevelt was booed,

13 News-Week, 9:7, October 31, 1936, "Campaign: Nominees Swing Into Enemy Zones..."

reported his body-guard, Reilly, in New York by "denizens of the Wall Street skyscrapers" and in Boston by Harvard students. 14 Political statisticians estimated that "all

but 3% of the nation's voters had made up their minds on the Roosevelt-Landon question by a fortnight ago. Hence,

15 *News-Week*, 8:6, October 31, 1936, "Campaign: Nominees Swing into Enemy Zones..."

for the support of that remaining group, "in obvious attempts to appear confident," each man dashed into territory admittedly favorable to his opponent.


The temper of the country was still variously assessed. The Socialist candidate, Norman Thomas, returning from a tour of twenty states, predicted Roosevelt's triumph. 17 Although the *Literary Digest* poll as a whole gave Landon 58% of the total vote, yet its sponsors admitted a margin of error of over 25%. 18 On the other hand,


the *Sun* poll of Maryland, a state which had voted the same way as the nation for forty-four years without exception, pointed toward a 64% vote for Roosevelt and 35% for
Landon. However, the fact that a poll involved a face-
to-face relationship with the taker, whereas the act of
defy was impersonal, brought in interpersonal relation-
ships in the poll which might have distorted its predic-
tion. Thus, the true temper of the voters was compara-
tively unknown as the campaign swung into its last fortnight
of speaking, newspaper comment and informal discussion.

The Audience

Roosevelt spoke at 10 o'clock on the evening of
October 21, 1936, before an audience of "five thousand--
only moderately enthusiastic" people in the Municipal
Auditorium in Worcester, Massachusetts. The crowd filled
every available seat. The speech was also broadcast to a
nation-wide audience.

19 New York Herald Tribune, October 10, 1936, Mark
Sullivan.

20 Harold F. Gosnell, Grass Roots Politics, American
Council on Public Affairs, Washington, D. C.,
1942, p. 2.

21 News-Week, 9:6, October 31, 1936, "Campaign:
Nominees Swing into Enemy Zones..."

Massachusetts had been traditionally a Republican state, and polls conducted in the state in mid-October showed only 46% of the vote for Roosevelt.\footnote{Washington Post, October 18, 1936.} Newspapers throughout New England were almost solidly Republican in persuasion, with the exception of one paper in the city in which the speech was made.\footnote{The Nation, 143:522, October 31, 1936, "Roosevelt Shows Up the Press," Heywood Brown.} Doubtless many of the Republicans agreed with the Boston critic who declared: "He comes too late. There is nothing he can now say which will speak louder than his actions of the last few years."\footnote{Boston Evening Transcript, October 21, 1936.}

A question as to the advisability of addressing a Bay State audience was also raised because of the factionalism existing in the Democratic party ranks in Massachusetts.\footnote{Ibid., Oliver McKee, Jr.}

Several factors may well have brought a large radio audience on October 21, 1936: the reiterated challenges to answer the questions of his opponents, the heightened fervor of the campaign,\footnote{ Ibid.} the wide contacts
As Landon became increasingly sharp in his criticism, underlings on both sides followed suit. Only Roosevelt refrained. News-Week, 8:6, October 31, 1936, "Campaign: Nominees Swing into Enemy Zones."

Roosevelt had made on his non-political and political tours.28

His trip to Colorado had brought his total since renomination to 17,927 miles; Landon's total in the corresponding time was 12,360. News-Week, 8:13, October 17, 1936, "Campaign: Roosevelt and Landon Race across Midwest."

The Immediate Setting of the Speech

The audience gave Roosevelt an ovation which "lasted a full minute and...promised to extend longer but for a gesture by the President, asking them to refrain in order not to waste radio time."29


Among those on the platform were these State leaders: Senator David I. Walsh, Governor Curley and Senator Marcus Coolidge. Senator Walsh had spent part of the day as the guest of the President on the ride through Massachusetts, but he was known to be "distinctly cool" toward the Roosevelt administration.30 Both he and Senator
Coolidge felt that they had been passed by in the matter of patronage. Governor Curley had somewhat embarrassed the Roosevelt campaign in Massachusetts by tying in his bid for a seat in the Senate with the Presidential campaign.

There was much Democratic resentment over his conduct of State affairs. Ibid., October 22, 1936.

It was indeed noticeable that during what the New York Times called the President's "triumphal progress" across the state, nowhere had he endorsed Governor Curley's candidacy.

On October 9 Governor Curley had received a telegram from the President's son, James Roosevelt, asking him to withhold expenditure of $10,000 voted by the executive council "to entertain the President on his campaign visit to Massachusetts." Chicago Daily News, October 9, 1936.

This address at Worcester came at the end of a day of travel by train to Providence, Rhode Island, and thereafter by automobile through the country to Boston and on
Joseph McGrath, chairman of the Democratic State Committee, had predicted that a fair day would bring more than one million people to greet the President on his trip. And on October 21, the crowds surpassed expectations. Holidays in schools and factories swelled the throngs; bands added to the excitement. It was considered the most exciting day of the campaign for the President and for the officials and newspapermen who travelled with him, both in regard to crowds and excitement. At Boston Roosevelt spoke from his automobile to a crowd of 175,000 people. Although Rhode Island and western Massachusetts had shown "unmistakable signs of strong Landon sentiment," the areas nearer Boston gave Roosevelt a warmer reception.

Although he received the "coolest reception of the day" at
Worcester, he spoke before a crowd which had filled the Municipal Auditorium several hours before his arrival.\(^{38}\)

\(^{38}\)Ibid.

At the close of the address, the radio audience who listened over the NBC hookup, heard prolonged applause, snatches of organ music and then the words of the announcer:

Ladies and Gentlemen, You have heard the President of the United States in another major address in his campaign for reelection, delivered at the end of a long, strenuous day of campaigning in Rhode Island and Massachusetts.

Tonight he spoke to the people of New England and to the entire nation by radio with his visible audience an overflow of many thousands in the Municipal Auditorium in Worcester, Massachusetts.

This program was sponsored by the Democratic National Committee and reached you directly from Worcester through the National Broadcasting Company.\(^{39}\)

\(^{39}\)Taken from a recording of this address made from its master records for this writer by the National Broadcasting Company.

**The Speech**

The President greeted Senator Walsh,\(^{40}\) Governor

\(^{40}\)Walsh "outdid himself" in introducing the President, despite his previous coolness toward the Roosevelt administration. *Boston Evening Transcript*, October 22, 1936.
Curley and Mayor Sullivan; a burst of applause interrupted his salutation. His generalized greeting, "my friends of New England," was inclusive of the whole traditionally Republican area.

Doubtless for the purpose of saving time, Roosevelt omitted the first two paragraphs of his prepared address, paragraphs which dealt with the recovery he had witnessed on his trip across the nation, and referred to the reception which had been given him that day in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. This assumption of their support was strong positive suggestion, as was also the firm, confident tone in which the statement was uttered.

The President's experience of that day had doubtless done much to give him real confidence. Farley pointed out the value of using a motor car for campaigning through the densely populated New England area, arguing that giving the throngs of industrial centers a chance to see the candidate was important.
All should rejoice over outcome of war on depression

Roosevelt's vividness of idea through contrasted elements was demonstrated in his reference to the "lovely autumn foliage" as less "welcome" to him than the evidences of renewed prosperity. The terseness and simplicity

44. This compliment to the beauty of the countryside established contact with the audience by its attention to matters of local pride. Sarett & Foster, op. cit., p. 392.

45. The logical pattern of the speech was as follows:

I. All should rejoice over the outcome of the war on depression.
   A. Renewed activity shows that the war is being won.
   B. Charges of the "hindsight" critic are unimportant.

II. The problem of "democracy in taxation" must be considered.
   A. The 1936 problem is a continuation of the 1776 one.
   B. Development of society has called on government to assume more obligations.
   C. Consequent tax burdens must be distributed according to ability to pay.

III. The major parties do not approach the problem similarly.
   A. The Republican stand is not desirable.
      1. After World War I they delayed payment of debt.
      2. In 1936 they protest delay in payment of debt.
      3. In power again they would defer payment.
   B. The Democratic stand is desirable.
      1. Their tax structure will pay cost of war against depression.
      2. They will not need increased taxes to
balance the budget in the near future.
3. They have improved the tax structure.
   a. They have reduced the income tax for the average American.
   b. They have increased the income tax for the higher brackets.
   c. They have reduced hidden taxes.
   d. They have distinguished between earned and unearned income.
   e. They have decreased tax rates on small corporations.
   f. They have increased tax rates on very large estates.
   g. They have plugged up loopholes in income tax by the undistributed profits tax.

IV. Citizens must be wary of tax misinformation.
   A. Federal administration will not tax local real estate to pay debt.
   B. Undistributed profits tax is not harmful.
      1. It allows a large per cent of corporations to pay less.
      2. It allows corporations to build adequate reserves.
      3. It allows stockholders to decide on investment of earnings.
   C. Taxes on products do not condemn the Federal government.
      1. Only few are Federal.
      2. Federal government has helped in bearing local taxes.
   D. Security tax does not endanger the wage earner.
      1. Employer also pays a share.
      2. Both sums are held for benefit of worker.

V. All citizens can exercise sovereignty in polling booths.

of his imagery, as "I have heard the sound of mills which were silent. I have seen men at work who were jobless," sharpened the contrast. The generalization, stating the
fact of recovery, was couched in terms of a "war," a
categorization of Roosevelt's belief that taking steps
in time of peace for social and economic gains was as truly
a "war" as a national struggle for political existence.

His casting of the attacks on recovery into a ludi­
crous figure—"the well-upholstered hindsight critic"—dimin­
ished indirectly the power of the charges. This statement
of the argument for refutation used also the motivative
appeal of indignation in its short, sharp characterization
of his opponents as having "had their chance and muffed it."
The first attack of the "critic" of recovery, occurred in
such arguments as Hoover's on the devaluation of the dollar

46 He claimed that Roosevelt "cancelled 41% of these
debts from foreigners... He made the foreigners a
gift of about three billions of dollars from Ameri­
can pockets." Vital Speeches, 3:50, November 1,
1936, "Book, Chapter, and Verse."

or the increased running expenses of government.

47 Hoover charged that these expenses, not including
relief, "have jumped to about six billions per annum.
That is an increase of two and one-third billions
from the Republican base." Ibid., p. 53.

The second attack, that "the cost was too great", may be illus­
trated from the same address by Hoover.

48...a large part of the burden the people have
willingly assumed for relief was used in hundreds of millions of reckless increase of ordinary routine expenses of government." *Ibid.*, p. 51.

that "something else won the war", may be shown from a speech by the president of the National Association of Manufacturers,\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{49}"American industry paid out billions of dollars during the depression to relieve the distress and suffering." *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59, *"The Great Highway,"* C. M. Chester.

or from Landon's address at Detroit on October 13, 1936.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{50}"The automobile industry, instead of talking about recovery, has worked for recovery. This industry has led the way back from depression. And I do not think it is without significance that this industry resisted at every turn the compulsory regulations imposed by the NRA. Indeed, one of its most distinguished leaders never signed the code of the Blue Eagle." *New York Times*, October 14, 1936.

Roosevelt evaded a direct answer on what had "won the war" and appealed to the sense of justice in his audience by his analogy, told in conversational form, with Joffre's winning the First Battle of the Marne.\textsuperscript{51} However, by

\textsuperscript{51}The previous year, when dedicating the White Face Memorial Highway at Lake Placid, New York, Roosevelt had referred to attending a conference in Washington, D. C., at which Joffre had been present in 1917. *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, Vol. IV, p. 358.

inference Roosevelt "won the war" and should only be defeated
if he had "lost the war."

The cost argument Roosevelt met first by pointing out that to bring this charge was to be inconsistent with an earlier stand and second by returning to battle terms.

52 Twenty-five Governors and representatives of twelve others, meeting in Washington on March 6, 1933, had passed a resolution urging the country "to cooperate with him in such action as he shall find necessary or desirable in restoring banking and economic stability." Ibid., Vol. II, p. 21.

which showed the impossibility of counting the cost during the "barrage."

He did not concern himself with the attack on the "strategy," but concluded the argument by lauding the victory itself. He had used the pattern: show the idea as wide-spread; explain and defend it; lift it to a high plane of thought.

The problem of "democracy in taxation" must be considered.

Roosevelt's explanation of this problem involves discussion concerning (1) taxes, (2) increased Federal expenditures, (3) distribution of tax load.

The President's compliment to New England referred implicitly to Landon's challenge to turn relief back to State and local agencies by its praise of "local control over

53 Speech at Cleveland, Ohio, October 12, 1936, New...
local affairs. Roosevelt's reference to the early Massachusetts patriot, Sam Adams, as his political ancestor

54 In 1764 Sam Adams drafted Boston's instructions to its representatives relative to the Stamp Tax; when the Townshend Acts were passed in 1767, he drafted the petition to the king and the circular letter of February, 1768, to the other colonies, asking their assistance. The Encyclopedia Americana, Americana Corporation, New York, 1943, Vol. I, p. 125.

added to the prestige of his leadership in New England.

Having thus touched New England's past history of taxation, the President defined taxes in the words of Mr. Justice Holmes, who had sat for thirty years on the bench in Massachusetts and who, as Supreme Court member, had taken a liberal view of constitutional construction. Reiteration of the idea in the colloquial imagery of a club—"Taxes... are the dues that we pay for the privilege of membership in an organized society"—brought the concept of taxes within the experience of his listeners.

The assumption of more obligations to its citizens by government in a "civilized society" had been widely recognized and the failure to deal with the additional

55 Mention should also be made of the changed attitude toward government which expects the latter to perform a positive role in providing for the welfare

needs Roosevelt assigned as a cause of the "crisis in the spirit and morale" in depression days. Landon pointed to the misuse of this theory as the basis for the unwarranted increase of Federal power.

"The prime needs of men have not changed since that Declaration, though new means from time to time may be necessary to meet those needs... As our economic life has become more complex and specialized, some need, real or apparent, has often been urged as an excuse for a further grant of power from the public." *Vital Speeches*, 2:669, August 1, 1936, "The Spirit of American Enterprise."

Roosevelt elaborated his argument of the rightful growth of federal function by paralleling it with the increase of local function, a strong comparison in New England; by pointing out with derogatory terminology and vigorous vocal expression the absurdity of Federal levy on property.

The President had referred to this Republican charge at least five times in the preceding ten days, in speeches at Pacific Junction, Iowa; Lincoln, Nebraska; Wichita, Kansas; Bloomington, Illinois; Chicago, Illinois. *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, Vol. V, pp. 426-87.
by asserting the background reasons to be "new inventions" and "a constantly growing social conscience;" by quoting Abraham Lincoln on "the legitimate object of government."

No real proof was necessary to show the need for large governmental expenditure, for the Republican position did not deny such need but only advocated the elimination of waste and extravagance in the outlay.

Roosevelt prefaced his declaration of principle by pointing out the continuing nature of the problem, relying upon a vaguely drawn analogy with the struggle of 1776 to lend the appeal of pride in country and add validity to the prediction of successful struggle for "democracy in taxation" in 1936. The analogy is really drawn between the taxation for expenditures within the colonies in early days and taxation for expenditures in the present, a valid comparison, but the prediction of success lies in the implied

---

59 Our government swung from major dependence upon customs duties to a "direct tax" in the 1790's, to a new series of excises and another direct tax in 1813, to a tax on real property in 1861, to a mixture of impositions during the Civil War, to income and inheritance taxes and then back to customs, finally to corporation and other non-commodity taxes, as well as to personal income and estate taxes, before the varied forms introduced during the World War. (William J. Shultz, American Public Finance, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1939, pp. 301-03). The rapid change from one form of public finance to another illustrates the "struggle...between two forces."
comparison with America's fight for democracy in taxation against the British. The colloquial expression, "That was the line-up," the directness and integration of audience with speaker, "Here is my principle, and I think it's yours too," and the characterization as an "American principle," replace logical reasoning in support of the idea of taxation "according to ability to pay."  

60 "One of the highest ideals of equitable taxation yet devised is ability to pay, when it is interpreted from the standpoint of social rather than individual, group, or class welfare." Alfred G. Buehler, Public Finance, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1940, p. 380.

The major parties do not approach the problem similarly. Roosevelt delineated the Democratic financing of the first World War as representative of the policy of rapid repayment and pointed to Republican reduction of taxes as showing the policy of deferment, arising from political involvements and resulting in a sixteen billion dollar debt at the opening of the depression. This argument was defective in its incomplete statement of the situation, 61 in its interpretation of political purposes.

61 Credit is due the Democratic direction of the Federal Treasury, for "through brilliant management and appeal to patriotic sentiment, it borrowed over $25,000,000,000 without disrupting the country's
financial organization." (Shultz, op. cit., p. 642). Landon replied to this address of the President in a press announcement. (Boston Evening Transcript, October 23, 1930). He pointed out correctly that the arrangement for repaying the debt was a sinking fund which would have "required three times" the years Roosevelt specified.

as being only the payment of "political debts", 62 and

62 "In 1926 and in 1928 Congress faced the alternatives of tax reduction or continued rapid debt retirement. Largely because of the expectation of continued foreign debt payments, tax reduction won the day on both occasions." Shultz, op. cit., p. 644.

in its misleading presentation of isolated data. 63 His

63 That the federal debt at the onset of the depression was sixteen billion dollars was true, but Roosevelt did not explain that the debt produced by the war had been reduced to this amount by the continued application of governmental surpluses which retired the debt faster than the sinking fund required. (Buehler, op. cit., p. 771). Landon pointed out that the Democrats had protested this policy.

claim that the taxation in war days (under Democratic administration) had been levied according to ability to pay was largely true. 64 Roosevelt's attempt to turn the

64 The heavy proportion of direct taxation--reaching 81% in 1919--has been designated the cause of the relatively strong fiscal position" of our country at the war's end. (Edwin R. A. Seligman, Essays in Taxation, Macmillan, New York, 1921, pp. 757, 760.)

Republican argument that New Deal spending was endangering
the future of the next generation upon the Republicans,

For example, Landon said at Buffalo, New York, on August 26, 1936, "The present administration's daily mounting deficits are closing the door of opportunity to your children and to my children." Vital Speeches, 2:762, September 15, 1936, "Federal and Family Finances."

though based upon spacious argument, was now enforced through statement in the form of a "little drama" with "actors" and "stage tears" designated. Concrete imagery of "the

Now let's keep this little drama straight. The actors are the same. But the act is different. Today their role calls for stage tears about the next generation."

driver's seat" added to the pathetic appeal of uniting the forces of audience and speaker against a common foe, an appeal made more vivid by direct statement, "But neither you nor I think that they are going to get back."

Roosevelt completed the analogy by declaring that the present tax structure would bring repayment in the present generation without new or increased taxation, for

Such promises were received with skepticism by the Republicans, who recalled that twice during the last fourteen months the President had asked for tax increases shortly after making such promises. New York Herald Tribune, August 15, 1936.

the action of recovery was making possible an early balancing
of the budget. The President's rhetorical question as to

68 This argument had little validity in view of the
President's own reservation in his budget estimate
for 1937 for additional funds for relief. It was
also not consistent with his reiterated premise that
government must bring welfare to its people when
it is recalled that 11,000,000 were still unemployed.

bankruptcy probably arose from charges such as those which
Hoover had made at the Republican National Convention in
June, 1936.69 And his pathetic appeal to the understanding

69 "We have seen varied steps toward currency infla-
tion that have already enriched the speculator and
deprived the poor. If this is to continue the end
result is the tears and anguish of universal bank-
ruptcy and distress." Vital Speeches, 2:571, June
15, 1936, "A Holy Crusade for Liberty."

of his audience increased by his words of command, "Keep
on", which preface his simple analysis of purchasing power,
as well as by the transition which appealed to their
judgment: "And here are some very simple and very inter-
esting figures."

Roosevelt's presentation of the New Deal taxation
program began with the individual income tax. His statement
that more than ninety nine per cent of heads of American
families paid less in 1936 than in 1932 was misleading in
its implications. Although rate changes and credit allow-
ance had made lighter tax loads possible in the lower
income group, yet Roosevelt was overlooking the fact that a great share of these family-heads would not have been paying a Federal income tax under either law, a consideration which destroyed the validity of his concluding percentage. The President used ironic statement, "taxed into rags and tatters", to minimize the effect of increased taxation on persons in the higher brackets; even stronger innuendo appeared in his narrative of his "friends" in the "very high upper brackets" who thought of moving to another nation because of taxes here. This innuendo was increased through the significant pause before the word "friends" and by the ironic tone on the phrase, "Now, I will miss them very much." The comparison of American taxes with tax burdens elsewhere and the prediction that the persons will "yearn...tax burdens in the United States are considerably lower than in most other leading countries." In proportion of taxes to national income, "calculation for 1934-1935 gives ratios of 17.7% for the United States, 16.2% for Canada, 22.8% for England, 20.6% for Germany, and 27.7% for France." Shultz,
once more for the good old taxes of the U. S. A."
stimulated the patriotic feeling of the listeners, a strong patriotic appeal.

Roosevelt's argument on "hidden taxes" was misleading, though perhaps justifiable. That the liquor tax

Treasury figures showed "consumption taxes" in 1933 to form 53.2% of the tax dollar, and 48.4% in 1936.
Since liquor taxes in 1936 (Groves, op. cit., p. 315) were 12.9%, the "consumption taxes" in 1933, without the liquor tax, would have formed 55.5% of the dollar. Since the terms involved here are so variously applied, it is difficult to justify comparison. Roosevelt's figures of 58% for 1933 and 38% for 1936 are not far from the percentages presented here.

had not been included in the 1932 figures was true; hence, its omission seemed to reduce the elements compared to stricter comparability. However, all other changes in the grouping were thus ignored; furthermore, the total impact of the "hidden taxes" was the significant comparison and the total impact would have brought the inclusion of the liquor tax. Additional confusion was added by the fact that the Treasury figures demonstrated a decrease in "consumption taxes", regardless of the presence of the liquor tax; thus, his conclusion was justifiable, though not dependent upon the reservation he has made. The light
tone of his reference to his removal of prohibition was strong evidence of adaptation of point of view to occasion, for his New England audience would have found it more acceptable than a Midwest group would have done.\textsuperscript{74} Landon's answer on this argument gave detailed figures of direct and indirect taxes from 1930 to 1936, emphasizing sixty-three cents on the dollar in 1936 for hidden and performance taxes. Landon demanded justification of reduction in the light of the sixty percent figure which Roosevelt had quoted in his letter to Roy Howard on September 2, 1935.\textsuperscript{75} This figure did not take into account the adjustments of either the Revenue Act of 1935 or of 1936, and was thus not comparable with the figures the President had used. The whole argument turned upon interpretation of terms whose meaning is not clearly defined in present fiscal usage.

Roosevelt's transition sentence to the next tax change—"How else have we improved and Americanized the tax

\textsuperscript{74} It should be recalled, since Roosevelt was speaking to "my friends of New England," that only Connecticut and Rhode Island had refused to ratify the Prohibition Amendment. Preston W. Slosson, The Great Crusade And After, 1914-1928 (A History of American Life, XII), MacMillan Co., New York, 1930, p. 107.

\textsuperscript{75} The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. IV, p. 356.
structure?"—was notable for its interest-quickening directness, but also because it identified the word "Americanized" with the procedure he was describing and provided a unifying slogan for his next explanations.

The implication of the President's argument on the addition of "a credit to earned income" was that this was Democratic policy; however, the Republican administration of 1924 first established the policy and then abolished it in 1932. Roosevelt restored it in 1934.76 Landon pointed out that the policy had originated with the Republicans.

The rhetorical question, "Wasn't that the American thing to do?" with strong emphasis on the word "that" appealed to the judgment of the audience and brought their vigorous applause.

That the Democratic administration had reduced tax rates on small corporations was true, both in the adoption of a graduated scale and in the tempering of the surtax scale for corporations with net income of less than $50,000.77 Increases of tax rates on high incomes had been made.78 The Revenue Act of 1935 placed taxes on very large
Increases in the individual surtaxes begin, according to the Revenue Act of 1935, with income brackets above $50,000, and go up progressively to a maximum of 75% on those above $5,000,000. Hacker, op. cit. p. 274.

Estates from 2% upon net taxable estates of less than $10,000 to 70% upon portions in excess of $50,000,000. 79

The President's explanation of the undistributed profits tax as "merely an extension of the individual income tax law" was justified 80 but that gave no hint of the untried nature of such taxation by American government. 81 Landon

This tax, adopted largely through the personal influence of Roosevelt, was consistent with his theory of the overexpansion of corporate activities as a major cause of the depression, had been considered by previous Democratic administrations, would increase public spending, and was somewhat similar to the British system. Alfred G. Buehler, The Undistributed Profits Tax, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1937, pp. 21-24.

had characterized the bill as "careless, ill-advised tax legislation," 82 and Hoover had spent the greater part of

Roosevelt's explanation of the propaganda\textsuperscript{84} as being paid

\textsuperscript{84}Not only did business organizations attempt to smother the tax while it was under Congressional consideration, but "the various sectional and national organizations of industrial groups have continued to direct broadsides of criticism against the measure because of its alleged complexities, inequalities, and unfortunate effects on corporations." Buehler, \textit{The Undistributed Profits Tax}, pp. 34-35.

for out of the investors' money was undoubtedly true, and his explanation of the tax as closing a loophole of the income tax was also valid. Although Roosevelt substituted the word "your" for his planned word "their"\textsuperscript{85} and thus lost the force of the comparison which he was trying to draw, it was likely that the sense of the whole argument carried the point across. That ninety-eight and a half percent of corporations paid a smaller normal corporation tax under the new law meant only that reductions in percentages on "normal-tax net income" had been made for those under forty thousand dollars, and meant little in view of the added tax.\textsuperscript{86} This comparison was also faulty through its neglect

\textsuperscript{85}\textit{The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt}, Vol. V, p. 528.

\textsuperscript{86}Ibid., October 1, 1936.
Every net income class up through $40,000 showed a higher average tax as a percentage of average net income under the 1936 law. Blakey, op. cit., p. 426.

of factors affecting one of its elements.

Roosevelt's analysis of the new privilege of choice in the use of money-dividends was the rhetorical amplification of a simple idea made forceful through the use of negation and parallel structure.

It has been suggested that Roosevelt's declaration of interest in the "principle" of the new tax and his statement that its "imperfections" would have to be removed, if found in application, hinted at the possibility of revision. Whether Roosevelt intended this implication or not, the suggestion of adjustability to the public good held pathetic appeal.

Citizens must be wary of tax misinformation

Roosevelt's method of reducing an argument by derogatory statement before making a direct attack was used here, coupled with an appeal to the judgment and prestige of the listeners by denying their gullibility.
The specific nature of the President's statement of incorrect labeling of taxes as to source began a light treatment of the issue; the half-humorously handling was continued in the use of colloquial words of warning, "But, my friends, stop, look, and listen." Specification and then generalization impressed the answer that only a few of them are Federal taxes. Following reports that Republican politicians were sponsoring propaganda incorrectly ascribing part of retail price increases to Federal taxation Attorney General Cummings on September 16, 1936, "called attention to the Federal Statute providing $1000 fine or a year's imprisonment, or both, for attributing part of the cost of a product to a tax when such a statement was known to be false or the tax was not as large as alleged." New York Times, September 17, 1936.

State and local taxes make up two-thirds of the tax burden was valid. His argument that the Federal government carried an even larger share of the burden through its assumption of the payment for the needy unemployed and Works Progress Administration figures for 1936 show that Federal expenditure for work relief and direct relief totaled $2,614,000,000 to the State and local total of $895,000,000, or 74.5% of the
through the effect of its reduction of interest rates upon local government debts was clear, valid exposition.

Further "misinformation" was being given the public through propaganda about the security tax placed in the pay envelopes of the workers. A complete change from the light-hearted treatment of the local-Federal tax confusion was evidenced in the serious, clear statement of the operation of this tax with contributions from both sources held for the benefit of the worker. At no point did the President answer the charges against the law as being "unjust, unworkable, stupidly drafted and wastefully financed," which Landon had made in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on September 26, 1936.
Roosevelt's summary of his whole tax argument consisted of an identification of the goals of the business men with those of other citizens, identification of most citizens as business men, identification of his opponents,94 policy as "special privilege in taxation." Pathetic appeal was strong in his rhetorical question to which he and his audience "know the American answer." Restatement of the forms of tax misinformation in strong, parallel form provided the background for the summary statement of faith. "But the American people will neither be bluffed nor bludgeoned."95

94 "It must always be remembered that Roosevelt had no hatred of business; in fact, he had considerable admiration for what he called the good businessman, those who made a contribution not only to the goods of the country but to the social advancement of their employees, customers and community." Frances Perkins, op. cit., p. 308.

95 This phraseology was reminiscent of Senator Steiwer's challenge in his keynote address at the Democratic National Convention; Steiwer had said: "The people will make the world know that this nation cannot be bought and cannot be bluffed." Vital Speeches, 2:574, June 15, 1936, "Three Long Years."

All citizens can exercise sovereignty in polling places

Exaltation of the American tradition of democratic
voting, which was the theme of Roosevelt's conclusion, was accomplished first by vivid imagery following the summary statement of the final argument:

Your pay envelope may be loaded with suggestions of fear and your dividend letter may be filled with propaganda. But the American people will neither be bluffed nor bludgeoned.

The seeds of fear cannot bear fruit in the polling booth.

Then followed repetition in parallel form of the idea of the sovereignty of citizenship in the polling booth. This abstract right was translated into cogent motivation to action by the strong, rapidly-spoken declaration of faith in action, "And there on November third they will not fear to exercise that sovereignty." 96

96 This emphasis upon "fear" in the conclusion added to the pathetic appeal through its tacit reference to one of the strongest relationships that Roosevelt had had to the American people, his elimination of fear in the early days of his administration.

Summary and Interpretation

Roosevelt, on a triumphal journey through New England, delivered in Worcester, Massachusetts, on October 21, 1936, a lucid and powerful address on taxation. In this city having the one truly Democratic newspaper in New England, the President set forth his theory of democracy
in taxation, explaining that few persons had carried heavier tax loads because of his administration's measures, whereas many had borne lighter burdens.

Many problems of finance stirred the voters in mid-October: consummation of a new monetary agreement with Britain and France; Vandenberg's radio attack on the President's expenditures; Hoover's bitter arraignment of Roosevelt's Pittsburgh address and Morgenthau's defense of it; Landon's criticism of the President's use of relief funds.

Landon and many others demanded an answer from Roosevelt as to whether he intended the restoration of the principle of the NRA.

Roosevelt refused the challenge to discuss the NRA but took up the financial issue, bending his efforts to show that Democratic taxation was the preferable way and that citizens must be wary of tax misinformation.

**Ideas and logical proofs**

Roosevelt returned to the comparison made in the Philadelphia address, declaring again that the struggle for economic liberty was comparable to the 1776 struggle for political liberty; however, he presented this idea without the terminology of the "economic royalists," which he had used before. The usage now of the term "democracy in taxation" was consistent with his purpose of reinterpretation, in the closing days of the campaign, of his attitude
toward business.

Assuming a historical attitude toward the idea of taxation, he explained taxes as the "dues" in an "organized society," showed the necessity for the increase of the government function in a more highly developed society, and asserted that taxation to serve these increased functions should be distributed according to ability to pay--"the only American principle." These were commonly-held beliefs which needed only explanation.

He charged the Republican Party with having put aside debt repayment after World War I, and thus imputed to his opponents action similar to that of which he had been accused--leaving tax burdens to be carried by the following generation. However, his accusation that the Republicans had deferred payment was defective, for they had paid the debt faster than the arrangements had specified. Therefore, in this argument, Roosevelt had no firm basis for this effort at turning the tables.

The President's support of Democratic taxation measures took the form of an explanation that the present tax structure would allow coverage of depression costs without increased taxation because recovery was bringing the necessary government revenues. This was the argument on balancing the budget with which he had closed his address.
in Pittsburgh; in both instances it was somewhat weak through neglect of factors like additional drains on the government made necessary by droughts and the unemployment problem.

He explained Democratic improvements in the tax structure which were aimed at readjusting the tax load to fall more lightly on those who could less afford to pay and more heavily upon those who could more afford to pay. His arguments regarding both the income tax changes and the reduction of hidden taxes were supported by accurate statistics but were misleading in their conclusions as to the extent of the benefits rendered. Roosevelt's claim of innovation of the "credit to earned income" policy was fallacious, for it had been employed also during Republican administrations. His arguments on the reduction of taxation of small corporations and the increase on very large estates were valid. Notwithstanding the defects in his treatment of income and hidden taxes and of the "earned income" concept, his argument had the cumulative effect of showing that Democratic taxation was moving toward greater use of the "ability to pay" doctrine.

Roosevelt argued against four forms of "tax misinformation," refuting them effectively by explanation and statistics. He pointed out that the Constitution
prevented the Federal Government from taxing real estate; that, of the many taxes on products, only few were Federal; and that both employer and employee payments under the Social Security Act were held for the benefit of the worker. All of these explanations were clear and valid. He refuted the alleged evils to corporations of the undistributed profits tax by accurate figures showing that a large per cent of the corporations would be paying a smaller tax load under the new law than before. Therefore, his reasoning on these mistaken tax ideas was both clear and compelling.

**Ethical proofs**

Roosevelt's basic purpose was to show that his administration of Federal taxation had been of benefit to the country. Saying, "Here is my principle and I think it's yours too," he designated the "ability to pay" theory as the "American" standard of taxation, and then explained all tax changes made by his administration as effective steps toward that ultimate goal. This method was powerfully effective in showing that he had handled the tax problem well.

The clarity and vigor of his explanations as to why certain beliefs about his program were really "misinformation" attested his intelligence and perspicacity. He called the voters to clear thinking by his declaration, "I
want to remind them that the new social security law was designed for them—for the greater safety of their homes and their families," and enhanced their appreciation of his leadership.

In addition to the inherent ethical appeal in these two major arguments of the address was the motivative effect of the opening compliment to Massachusetts on the "lovely autumn foliage," with his qualification that the evidences of recovery were even more "welcome" to him. This complimentary reaction to the surroundings, characteristic of Roosevelt's speeches, served to win him the good will of his auditors.

**Pathetic proofs**

This speech was comparable to the acceptance address in the powerful pathetic appeal of its basic premise. In the Philadelphia speech, Roosevelt's premise had been that government must afford the private citizen economic freedom of such a type as to give him "not only something to live by, but something to live for." In the speech in Worcester, his arguments stemmed from the premise that "American" taxation should be adjusted on the basis of their "ability to pay." These were fundamental American doctrines and they struck at deep human drives of self-preservation and love of family and home. The Worcester speech drew
with motivating effect upon the comparison of the present economic struggle with the fight of 1776, as had the speech in Philadelphia.

As Roosevelt had complimented New York State on the work of Governors Smith and Lehman, and Nebraska on the "historic career of service" of Senator Norris, so here he praised Massachusetts for her maintenance of the "Town Meeting" and pointed out that her Sam Adams had fought in early days for "democracy in taxation." Not only was this appeal to state pride strong in its recognition of Massachusetts as "one of the senior partners in the company of the states," but in its emphasis on the fact that the goal which he was setting for the nation was one in which Massachusetts had believed from Revolutionary days. As in many of Roosevelt's addresses, this explanation of a point under consideration held within it refutation of a charge which had been levelled against him; in this case he was answering the charge of having turned America aside from her traditional course in government.

Arrangement

Although the major ideas of this address were more independent of each other than in many of Roosevelt's addresses, yet the progression of ideas followed an effective order: taxation is necessary; Republicans evaded
their tax responsibilities; Democratic taxation is based on the ability to pay; citizens must be wary of "tax misinformation." To set forth his theories of taxation and then judge both Republican and Democratic tax policies on these standards—this was the natural order of thinking and thus especially easy for the audience to follow.

The first idea of his progression might have been taken for granted, but Roosevelt tied the taxation problem in closely with the development of society and evolved a strong argument that under present conditions the people would expect to pay higher taxes. The relative amounts of time spent on the different tax measures were well allocated: such taxes as those on "very large estates" probably did not much concern his present audience and received short treatment; a tax challenged by his opponents, such as the undistributed profits tax, was treated at length from several angles of approach.

Language

The colloquial, conversational tone in word-choice and sentence structure extended throughout the address. Clear exposition through amplification and definition played a larger part in this address than in many others. Concrete imagery, disparaging terms for opponents,
interrogatory refrain, pertinent anecdote—these added directness and power to the explanation of taxation. The President set forth his light or serious, or even sarcastic, treatment of ideas by appropriate choice of language. Word-choice supported the weighty aspect of the subject, as in "Once more this year we must choose between democracy in taxation and special privilege in taxation," and brought out the flippancy of the declaration that Americans, going abroad to escape taxation, would "yearn once more for the good old taxes of the U. S. A." Although his condemnation of the Republicans for their relation to the monopolists had been equally strong in the Philadelphia address, there it had been distant and general, whereas in the Worcester address it was direct, specific and caustic.

Delivery

Roosevelt varied the expository nature of this address with forceful utterance of key sentences, a belligerent note in contrasted ideas, a taunting tone in his reference to those in the "very high upper brackets." Particularly effective was his use of the pause to add significance to the word which followed. The directness of delivery was consonant with the requirements of the smallest face-to-face audience to which he had delivered
a major political address in the campaign.

Thus, Roosevelt, discussing taxation in New England "Yankee" territory, gave a well-reasoned, though over-simplified, explanation of the theory and practice of taxation in democratic America. He had accepted the challenge to make his stand clear on money policies, but had avoided completely one of the questions which the people of Massachusetts had hoped to hear discussed, that of the restoration of the NRA. The address was a significant political explanation of taxation with enough clarity for the immediate audience to grasp the ideas well but enough oversimplification and slanted interpretation to arouse his critics.

Reactions to the Speech

The President could not have failed to notice the lack of demonstrative enthusiasm among the townspeople lining the streets of the business section in Worcester as he passed enroute to his train; however, on the following day, as his trip through Connecticut came to a close, he manifested great enthusiasm over his favorable...
reception in that state. He mentioned his affection and

friendship for Governor Cross, who, although a Democrat in a traditionally Republican state, was running for reelection for a fourth term. And he added the prediction

which he had used so often in states known to be more favorable to his reelection:

And I know that on the third of November...I am going to get a telegram from Wilbur Cross and a lot of my old friends here, telling me that the State of Connecticut is in the Democratic column.

However, the polls showed no change after the speeches in the per cent favoring Roosevelt in either Massachusetts or Connecticut.

In addition to Landon's thirty thousand word press reply to Roosevelt's taxation address at Worcester, an extemporaneous reply from Ogden L. Mills repeated the challenge of the eight million still unemployed, and declared
the New Deal government travelling in the same direction as the totalitarian governments of the Old World.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{102}Boston Evening Transcript, October 22, 1936.

The Worcester speech did not discuss the NRA, the TVA, and the "planned society," which residents of Massachusetts would like to have heard argued;\textsuperscript{103} and it was not likely that it settled much on the question of taxation. However, it was probable that the appearance of the President among millions of New Englanders, especially working classes, and that his homey words of greeting did win support for him. Governor Curley and other Democratic leaders maintained that the demonstration accorded Roosevelt on his 160-mile automobile journey through many industrial communities and his speeches in Boston and in Worcester "forecast success for both national and State tickets."\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{104}Ibid.

The reception of such an address by a radio audience would differ widely, on the basis of previous attitudes toward the President's policies, as in any speech, but also, in this address on more specific principles and programs
than Roosevelt usually discussed, on the basis of knowledge concerning the history, theory and application of taxation. With a basis of appraisal for the policies discussed, the listeners would have more than previous general attitude and present impression upon which to make decisions. The presence or absence of this understanding in Roosevelt's radio listeners on October 21 was an added factor in their reception of his ideas.
Chapter VII

ADDRESS AT MADISON SQUARE GARDEN,
NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 31, 1936

The Background

During October, the nation rang with political speeches;\(^1\) in general, however, neither the argument nor the issue was new.\(^2\)

\(^1\)Landon made 23; Roosevelt, 19; Knox, 13; Hamilton, 6; Al Smith, 4; Father Coughlin, 4; Governor Lehman, 18; Ike, 5; Hull, 3; Wallace, 3; Farley, 4. The Nation, 143: 533-534, November 7, 1936, "The Shape of Things."

\(^2\)Oswald G. Villard declared, "So the feeling that this campaign has been all shadow boxing, grossly artificial and apart from the realities of life, has stolen over me again and again." Ibid., 143: 521, October 31, 1936, "Issues and Men."

Landon challenged Roosevelt's methods, though accepting his intentions, in an address at Phoenix, Arizona, on October 21, 1936;\(^3\) discussed one relatively untouched issue—that of ways of preventing war—at Indianapolis, Indiana, on October 24, 1936;\(^4\) claimed, at
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on October 26, 1936, that the fundamental issue of the campaign was the preservation of the Constitution and the American way of life, and condemned the President's use of Federal funds;\(^4\) challenged,\(^5\)

at Pittsburgh, on October 27, 1936, the Democratic use of the spoils system;\(^6\) at Newark, on October 28, 1936,\(^6\)

concentrated his attack upon the Social Security Act;\(^7\)

He pointed out (1) that final payment would be made by employees and consumers; (2) that the Act had only limited coverage; (3) that it was the largest tax measure; (4) that it laid too heavy a burden on the younger workers; (5) that it made necessary a Federal check on jobs; (6) that it posed a problem of a huge reserve fund; (7) that it would prove a disappointment to the old people. \(^{\text{Ibid.}, \, \text{October 29, 1936.}}\)

and struck at the Social Security Act again, on October 29, 1936, at Madison Square Garden, claiming that it assumed the public improvident and that its reserves could be appropriated by any Congress, and closed by demanding that the President tell his purposes and his intentions.
regarding the AAA, the NRA, and the concentration of governmental power.  

Ibid., October 30, 1936.

Meanwhile Roosevelt addressed guests at business men's dinners throughout the nation by radio on October 23, 1936, reiterating his Chicago assurances of good will to private enterprise and attacking the propaganda sent out against the Social Security Act.  

Emphasized labor's gains in collective bargaining and explained the Social Security Act at Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, on his way to Harrisburg, where he stressed rural and urban recovery, condemning the "sectionalism" of the Republicans and urging "interdependence and unity";  

Later in the afternoon he spoke to 80,000 people in Camden, New Jersey, reminding them of the insurance of bank deposits and the stabilizing of price levels, and
explaining the Social Security program"; in the evening

he addressed about 50,000 persons from the rear platform
of his special train in Wilmington, Delaware, reading
Lincoln's definition of liberty in the home city of the
DuPont corporation owners who had been instrumental in
organizing and financing the Liberty League, a group

seeking the defeat of the New Deal. He spoke on October
30, 1936, at Brooklyn, New York, praising the New Deal
agencies for relief and economic recovery, explaining the
Social Security Act, and claiming that unity of classes
instead of division was being accomplished.

One of the outstanding problems in late October
was the pay-envelope campaign, started by the industrial-
ists in the Detroit area, to discredit the Social

"On the next pay day in many factories, large and
small, throughout the Midwest region, workers are
scheduled to receive their wages in envelopes bearing this
legend: 'Pay Reduction (in large red letters)--Effective
January, 1937, we are compelled by a Roosevelt 'New Deal'
law to make a 1 per cent deduction from your wages and
turn it over to the government. Finally this may go as
high as 4 per cent. You might get this money back in future years... but only if Congress decided to make the appropriation for this purpose. There is NO (in capital letters) guarantee. Decide, before Nov. 3—Election Day—whether or not you wish to take these chances.'

"Blank pay envelopes, bearing this printed matter on their front, are being distributed to employers through state headquarters [of the Republican party] in the industrial sections of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania. The printed warning has already been copied on placards in some instances, and tacked up in industrial plants.... The envelope scheme is understood to have been originated by industrialists in Detroit and to have been turned over to the Republican National Committee for execution." New York Times, October 24, 1936, Turner Catledge.

Security Act. Landon made his attacks on the Act in the Newark and Madison Square Garden addresses; Hamilton and others assisted in the assault. Nationwide newspaper advertising and a shower of circulars added to the barrage. The Democratic headquarters in New York put its orators on the networks to defend the Act; Democratic newspapers explained its provisions; the American Federation of Labor mobilized its local agents to war against the Republican offensive. Roosevelt made at least four major explanations of the security program. The results of this last-minute Republican strategy were of two kinds: defections from their own party ranks,16 and the change in betting odds

16 Charles Edison, president of the Thomas A. Edison Industries, the Pennsylvania Retailers Association, the American Retail Federation, and the Pennsylvania Lorillard...
Tobacco Company, are examples. News-Week, 8:7-8, November 7, 1936, "Election: Landslide Gives Roosevelt Four More Years..."

on the candidates during the year.\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\)"The late Republican attack...pulled pro-Roosevelt betting odds down from 3-1 to 2-1--the sharpest change of the year." Ibid.

Events in Europe were becoming more alarming as October drew to a close;\(^{18}\) Landon declared, in his address

\(^{18}\)On October 22 Britain, France and Czechoslovakia forced Russia to abandon her attempts to expose the activities of Fascist powers in Spain (New York Times, October 23, 1936); the following day Ethiopia appealed to the League of Nations for aid against Italy's renewed assault. Ibid., October 24, 1936. On October 24 Britain accused the Soviet of shipping arms to Spain, and Germany recognized the Italian conquest of Ethiopia. Ibid., October 25, 1936. Rioting broke out in Brussels on October 25. Ibid., October 26, 1936. Britain protested a Japanese "Incident" on the 27th. Ibid., October 28, 1936. On October 28 Goering spoke against the "foreign fist," opening the second German four-year plan. Ibid., October 29, 1936. Rebel planes dropped bombs on Madrid on the 30th, and fear of a Pan-Arabian movement in Iraq began to develop. Ibid., October 31, 1936.

at Indianapolis on October 24, 1936, that "there is no more important question before mankind today than whether peace shall rule the world, or war."\(^{19}\) Roosevelt had not spoken

\(^{19}\)Ibid., October 25, 1936.

of world conditions in a major address since his speech at
Chautauqua, New York, on August 14, 1936, but on August 20, in this address he had said, "I have seen war... I hate war." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 289.

October 28, in his address on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Statue of Liberty, he spoke of the "message of peace" which America must send out. No longer could foreign problems be entirely passed by.

Roosevelt did not answer the question concerning the possible restoration of the NRA. And certainly more concern over his silence was being shown by his political opponents than by business itself.

20 In this address he had said, "I have seen war... I hate war." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 289.

21 "Even in times as troubled and uncertain as these, I still hold to the faith that a better civilization than any we have known is in store for America and by our example, perhaps, for the world." Ibid., p. 543.

22 Paul Mallon commented on the President's unusual cancellation of two press conferences in the midst of a campaign. "It is more than an excellent guess that certain partisan and neutral newsmen intended to press Mr. Roosevelt for clarifying explanations of the NRA purpose." Washington Star, October 20, 1936. When asked about James Roosevelt's assertions as to the possible restoration of the program, he referred his questioners to his speeches, especially those of the last month and a half. New York Times, October 28, 1936. Since no answer is given in those addresses, it is clear that the President intended to give none.
Willard L. Thorp, Director of Economic Research, Dun and Bradstreet, speaking before the Cotton-Textile Institute Annual Meeting on October 28, 1936, declared: "I have not yet seen, in the program of either party, any specific proposal which holds an immediate threat to the underlying economic trend. Nor do the stock markets or other indicators of business sentiment indicate that there is any marked concern over the election." (Vital Speeches, 3: 78, November 15, 1936, "We Need Economic Leadership")

On the same day as Mr. Thorp made his address, the New York Times carried this headline: "Business in nation spurt; U. S. Steel to raise wages." New York Times, October 28, 1936.

Predictions of the outcome of the election were still at variance. The Literary Digest poll, in its seventh report, showed Landon leading in thirty-two of the states and sweeping the electoral college by 370 to 161. In its eighth report, the poll showed Landon holding the lead, with 54.8 per cent of those polled.

The Nation, 143: 465, October 24, 1936, "How Wrong is the Digest poll?"

Its final report gave Landon 1,293,669 votes; Roosevelt, 972,897. This continued insistence upon a Republican
victory was diametrically opposed to the report of the American Institute of Public Opinion; that bureau reported on October 17 that Roosevelt would have 35 of the states, and 390 electoral votes to Landon's 141.  

27 The Nation, 143: 465, October 24, 1936, "How Wrong is the Digest poll?"

It should be noted that, whereas the Literary Digest poll did not reach the industrial centers adequately, the American Institute did not reach the small towns and rural areas adequately. 28

28 Ibid.

James A. Farley, who had been with the President on the October tour, declared his belief to be that the journey through New England had "clinched the greater part" of that region for Roosevelt, and that only Maine and Vermont would go Republican. 29 Paul Ward wrote on

29 New York Times, November 1, 1936.

October 25: "Early this past week Hearst sent a confidential 'rush' wire to all his editors ordering them thenceforth to play down political news and be strictly impartial." 30 Hearst papers, which had spread the Landon story
fully so far in the campaign, now scarcely mentioned his name. Because of Farley's close contact with political leaders in all areas, and because of Hearst's reversal of opinion, these reports were indicative of a popular swing to Roosevelt throughout the country.

As Roosevelt went about New York City on October 28, 1936, making short speeches, he travelled more than thirty miles, "without passing a block whose sidewalks were not jammed with enthusiastic crowds." The only jarring note was "one brief interlude of booing as he passed down lower Broadway. Even there the volume of cheers and applause was so great as to make the demonstration against him seem insignificant." This
enthusiasm for Roosevelt in New York City seemed to promise him the much-desired forty-seven electoral votes.  

In a prediction written a week before this triumphal day, Carl Randau had declared that the city's vote would determine the result in the state, and that there was "every likelihood" that Roosevelt would have a lead of more than a million votes. The Nation, 143: 472, October 24, 1936, "Will New York Go for Roosevelt?"

In contrast it should be noted that, on his semi-final tour, Landon had been "booed at every stop except in Indiana."  

Both parties were making a strenuous effort at this time to win the foreign-language vote. For example, the Democratic party used six languages (Italian, German, Jewish, Polish, Hungarian, and Greek) in a dozen important cities to reach these people by radio. Most of

Phonograph recordings were also used. Literary Digest, 122: 17, October 31, 1936, "Campaign Clash."

the 800 foreign-language newspapers and periodicals read by the eight million foreign-born, naturalized citizens were Democratic.

Ibid., 122: 19, October 24, 1936, "Campaign Has Its
The Audience

The crowd of 20,000, who had gathered to hear the President on October 31, 1936, filled Madison Square Garden. This meeting was the annual rally with which Tammany Hall, by tradition, closed the campaign on the Saturday preceding the election. Tickets had been given out for reserved seats on the main floor, but Tammany had invited the Democrats "from the neighborhoods" to fill the highest tier. They came in overwhelming numbers, hundreds parading in local groups. Outside the packed hall were some eight thousand others who were to hear the address over amplifiers placed at Eighth Avenue and 49th Street.

The President was heard over the national hook-ups of both the Columbia Broadcasting System and the National Broadcasting Company.

There is no doubt that the President's audience in the hall was indeed a favorable one; doubtless most of
the overflow crowd also was made up of New Yorkers faithful to Roosevelt and the New Deal. On the other hand, it is likely that Roosevelt's voice found its way into homes and halls over the country by radio transmission where his sentiments were either strongly welcomed or vigorously denounced on the basis of whether the listeners had decided to vote for or against Roosevelt.

The Immediate Setting of the Speech

Tammany Hall's speakers' bureau had planned a "sea of flags" for the rally; at each seat a small American flag had been furnished and the crowd caught them up and waved them enthusiastically on any provocation. Large flags hung from the rafters. As Senator Wagner picked up the gavel, the band played "The Star Spangled Banner" and a huge flag ascended to the roof directly behind the rostrum. Lithographs of President Roosevelt and of Governor Lehman were displayed.

Community singing of old favorites--"Happy Days are Here Again," "School Days," "Tammany, Tammany," "There'll be a Hot Time in The Old Town Tonight"--was carried on in a fast-moving, exhilarating way. The

Ibid.
highly-stimulated audience, many of whom had been in their seats for over an hour before the speaking began at 8 o'clock, cheered and yelled for the district leaders as they entered; the roars which greeted Governor Lehman on his entrance almost covered the strains of the band, and a real ovation burst forth for Jimmie Walker, once mayor of the city. The President's family--his mother, his wife, Mrs. James Roosevelt, and Mr. and Mrs. John Boettiger--were given an ovation with the audience standing and applauding when they arrived to take their places on the platform.

Senator Wagner, who had drafted much of the New Deal legislation, presided at the rally, hailing the Roosevelt administration for its "tremendous achievements" and its "record of recovery and social advancement unequalled in the history of the world." State and local candidates addressed the throng between eight and nine o'clock, with the speeches broadcast over local stations. Governor Lehman spoke at nine o'clock, his speech broadcast over a State-wide network. 41

41Ibid.

When Roosevelt arrived upon the platform, the crowd gave him a thirteen minute ovation. The President
acknowledged the riotous welcome, bowing and waving to the throng. More than once he moved toward the microphones to attempt to bring the expression of enthusiasm to a close before the crowd finally was quieted.

At the close of the address, the audience cheered loudly until the chairman assumed the microphone. However, cheering broke out again when Roosevelt, leaving the stage with his party, waved his hand to the thousands before him and called out, "Good night and good luck." 42

42 Ibid.

The President had been cheered by New York crowds three times during the one week: on the twenty-eighth as he made his short commemorative speeches, on the thirtieth when he addressed the crowd at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, and now on the thirty-first as he arrived at Madison Square Garden to close his active campaign for reelection. He had been applauded by thousands in the streets as he rode at the head of a motor procession, preceded by fifty cycle-mounted policemen, from his New York home to the auditorium. 43 He was doubtless encouraged by

43 Ibid.
this repeated demonstration of favor.

The address which the President was to deliver had been prepared in an atmosphere of resentment against the Republicans for their pay-envelope attack. 44

44"It had made the President angry, and so Corcoran, Cohen, and High dipped their pens in vitriol for their final effort. Corcoran supplied the framework of the speech. High, who had a gift for the telling phrase, was the author of much of the imagery...it was finished, quickly reshaped by the President, and delivered at Madison Square Garden." Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner, Men Around the President, Doubleday Doran & Co., New York, 1939, p. 108-109.

"The famous Madison Square Garden speech in the second campaign, which drew so much praise, was written by Tommy Corcoran." J. T. Flynn, op. cit., p. 66.

Thus, with an immediate audience of partisans, who were exhilarated by party functioning and party oratory, and a radio audience of uncounted numbers with all shades of opinion, Roosevelt had an opportunity to bring the campaign to a close with point and power.

The Speech

Roosevelt's salutation to Senator Wagner and Governor Lehman was a greeting to old friends, 45 and his

45"Senator Wagner, a staunch New Dealer, had stood with Roosevelt for social legislation in the New York Senate in the terms immediately following 1910. Governor Lehman,
who had greatly desired to retire from his position in 1936, was induced to run again through strong insistence from Roosevelt, who pointed out that their long cooperation for social legislation in the State would be set at naught if the governorship fell into the wrong hands. (Letter to Lehman, June 29, 1936) The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 236-237.

well-known words of address, "my friends, " this time, were perhaps inclusive of his entire radio audience since they omitted the localization which often accompanied them when they were used in salutation at the opening of a speech. 46

46 In Omaha on October 10, 1936, he had said, "you, my friends of Nebraska and neighboring States"; in Chicago on October 14 he had declared, "my friends of the great State of Illinois"; at Worcester on October 21, his greeting had been "my friends of New England."

The rhetorical pattern of the speech is as follows: (1) Restoration of democracy is the issue; (2) Democratic administration has fulfilled the hopes of peace; (3) This achievement has been a struggle; (4) The administration has just begun to fight for many objectives; (5) The nation will seek peace. 47

47 The supporting ideas are thus arranged:
I. Restoration of democracy is the issue.
II. The Democratic Administration has fulfilled the hopes for peace.
   A. It brought personal security.
B. It brought community security.
C. It brought security within the nation.
D. It maintained peace with other nations.

III. This achievement has been a struggle.
A. Powerful forces strive to reinstate indifferent government.
B. The pay-envelope campaign is not worthy.
   1. Any such message is coercive.
   2. The payment statement is deceitful.
      a. It fails to mention the employer's matching contribution to the old-age fund.
      b. It fails to mention the employer's complete contribution to the unemployment insurance fund.
3. The suggestion of Congressional diversion of funds is an attack on the integrity of the American government.
4. The entire attack questions the judgment of the many Republican Congressmen who voted for it.
5. The attack endangers honest business.

IV. The Administration has just begun to fight for many objectives.
A. It will continue to seek to improve the working conditions of laborers.
B. It will continue to seek to bring a better living for Americans.
C. It will continue to seek to improve the lot of the farmers.
D. It will continue to provide useful work for the needy unemployed.
E. It will continue to help the youth, the crippled, the blind, the mothers, the aged.
F. It will continue to protect consumers' prices and increase purchasing power.

V. The nation will seek peace.
A. The causes of unrest and antagonism in our country will be removed.
B. Devotion to the best in the people and for the nation makes accord possible.

Restoration of democracy is the issue
Coming after the thirteen minutes of tumultuous welcome, Roosevelt's invocation of a calm and unprejudiced appraisal of the national effect of the election outcome must have held a strong pathetic impact in its emphasis upon the justice and vision of the audience. This sense of involvement in an issue of great moment was deepened by Roosevelt's disclaimer of the importance of "the continuance in the Presidency of any individual," and the ethical appeal of humility in the speaker was added. It is likely that listeners who were unsympathetic to Roosevelt would have considered this appearance of humility insincere.

That the issue in 1932 was the restoration of American democracy is Roosevelt's interpretation of the effects of the economic crisis. 48 The "mood to win" was well demonstrated in the report made by Governor Landon, who attended the oil control conference in Washington in March, 1933, 49 and in the pledge of support adopted at the

48 Roosevelt had declared, in accepting the 1932 nomination, that "it is inevitable that the main issue of this campaign should revolve about the clear fact of our economic condition, a depression so deep that it is without precedent in modern history." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 650.

49 He declared that "as a Republican Governor" he wanted to enlist "for the duration of the war in this campaign of President Roosevelt to get America on its feet." He advocated allocation of production, adding
that "even the iron hand of a dictator is better than paralysis." *New York Times* , March 27, 1935.

Governors' Conference, March 6, 1933. 50 That the American

50 "Without regard to our political affiliations we Governors...hereby express our confidence and faith in our President and urge the Congress and all the people of our united country to cooperate with him in such action as he shall find necessary or desirable in restoring banking and economic stability." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. II, p. 21.

people had "won" needed no proof with purchasing power of the public threatening in October, 1936, to outrun production in several fields. 51 Roosevelt's repetition of


this series--the issue, the mood, the outcome--provided a strong framework for his prediction of success in 1936, a prediction pleasant to the ears of his Tammany audience and his supporters in all states through its compliment upon past success and its recognition of the present situation. Such a strong outburst of applause followed his statement regarding their present mood that his climactic phrase, "And again they will win," was lifted with vigorous, staccato utterance above the din. The sentence with which he had closed his acceptance speech in Chicago on July 2, 1932, 52 cast the struggle in terms of
a "crusade," an uplifted concept of strong pathetic power and with special possibilities of effectiveness with an audience of strongly organized party members with American flags in their hands. His declaration that the nation was "still on the march" under those "banners" expressed the continuity of effort, upon which he was basing his appeal to the electorate for a return to office.

His substitution of the generalized word, "forefront," for the military term, "van," is an interesting exception to his customary substitution of the specific word for the general. Several reasons for the substitution may be suggested: that a one-syllable word would not allow the stress which Roosevelt wished to use; that the less technical word would serve the purpose of "instant intelligibility" more effectively; that the speaker desired the alliteration afforded by the word "forefront" in the phrase following the word "fly"; that he simply lost his place and said the first word that occurred to him.

The Democratic administration has fulfilled the hopes for peace

Roosevelt's declaration that it was "needless to repeat the details" of his program afforded an appeal to the loyalty of his audience, a pathetic appeal strengthened by his appraisal of their feeling as being above harm from any attack. The power of phraseology was
Doubtless the "misrepresentation or statistical contortion" referred to the recent attacks on the Social Security Act, in particular the statement that the levy would likely go to 4% whereas the law placed 3% as the final proportion. That these attacks were judged unscrupulous by many was illustrated by the turn of certain industrial leaders to the Roosevelt group. Outstanding examples of "exaggerations of over-zealous friends" were Farley's reference to Kansas as a "typical" prairie state (Vital Speeches, 2:551, June 1, 1936, "The New Deal and Its Critics") and the statement of the President's son, James Roosevelt, as to the restoration of the NRA.

Demonstrated in this argument in its strikingly apt picturization of the Roosevelt program as being hammered out "on the anvils of experience," and in its disparaging characterization of his opponents and their methods.55

Contrary to this vigorous denial, it was significant that, within the preceding week, Roosevelt had made four explanations of the Act and that newspapers, speakers and organizations, had rushed to work to prevent the misleading of the people on this issue; it was further significant that he devoted one-fifth of this address to an attack on the pay-envelope campaign.

With this compliment to the impregnability of his audience, Roosevelt turned to consideration of his
administration's record with the speculative question, "Just what was our hope in 1932?" His choice of the word "peace" to answer the question, rather than the word "security," which he used so frequently, was doubtless the result of the plan of his address to tie peace in America with the larger concept of peace in the world at a time of increasing turmoil in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Use of vivid contrast occurs in the specification: "They wanted peace of mind instead of gnawing fear." Roosevelt's analysis of their desires allowed him the opportunity of listing his achievements as requests from the people; his arrangement was notable for its natural progression of point of view from the local to the world scene, for its clarity of transitional words—first, next, also, finally. Roosevelt's reference to his hatred of war as being known by the nation afforded a

---

56 As in his address at Wichita, Kansas, on October 13, 1936, (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 459-460), and in his extemporaneous remarks at Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 16, 1936. Ibid., p. 500.

57 He had used a similar method in approaching the desires of the business men in the Chicago address of October 14, 1936.

58 He had made a dynamic assertion of his hatred in
his address at Chautauqua, New York, on August 14, 1936, (Ibid., p. 289); Landon had jibed at this declaration in his Indianapolis speech of October 24, 1936, stating that he would "not merely talk about my hatred of war." New York Times, October 25, 1936.

good balance to his claim that he recognized the nation's hatred of war, and alternation of idea which afforded

59 It should be recalled that the greatest enthusiasm of the audience at Omaha, Nebraska, had been evinced at Roosevelt's statement that "A growing trade is making for international peace." Omaha World Herald, October 11, 1936.

strong pathetic appeal through its identification of listeners and speaker. His dynamic assertion—as conclusion of this analysis—that his record had answered these hopes for peace and thus provided a "well-founded expectation for future peace" was based upon the assumption of continuity of objectives, the only requirement of government, according to Roosevelt's thinking. His opponents disagreed, for they asked continuity of method also. Thus Roosevelt's supporters would accept the validity of this prediction, but his adversaries would vigorously deny it.

This listing of desires of the American people in 1932 was one way of pointing out graphically the details of the administration's policy; listing the persons who had these desires in the form of a "roll of honor" provided the framework for a recital of the evils which the administration had to meet, and implied the continued
loyalty of these groups to the New Deal government.

Repetition (with slight variation) of the words "written on that roll of honor are the names" allowed Roosevelt to set forth strikingly ideas basic in his philosophy—that government must help those who "never had a chance," and those "who despaired," and that Americans were concerned over the welfare of their fellow citizens. The lang-

60 Frances Perkins declared, "He made an indelible impression on his own country and on the world, changing the direction of political thought through knowledge of human needs and suffering and emphasis upon the provision of the good life for the common man." (Op. cit., p. 5) Emil Ludwig wrote, "Roosevelt is an enemy of tragedy..." Roosevelt, a Study in Fortune and Power, Viking Press, New York, 1938, p. 296.

Roosevelt seemed to feel that the American people were sensing the relationships of people and government, as he said in his final speech of this campaign, on November 2, 1936, "I doubt if there was ever more downright political intelligence at the average American fireside than there is today." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 579.

Usage of this passage was striking in its concreteness, its connotative power, its strong use of balanced, parallel structure, and the expressive fulness of its

61 "men at starvation wages, women in sweatshops, children at looms."

62 "for whom opportunity had become a will-o-the-wisp"; "frugal citizens"; "acres yielded only bitterness."

63 "written on it are the names of farmers whose acres
yielded only bitterness, business men whose books were portents of disaster, home owners who were faced with eviction, frugal citizens whose savings were insecure."

Amplification. Roosevelt had set forth his record vividly, and had taken for granted continued adherence to it. His inclusion of the business men on the "roll" of 1932 and also of 1936 was effective in its assumption of their gratitude and loyalty. His reference to

At the time Roosevelt spoke, contributions from industrialists were beginning to pour into Democratic Party coffers. (The Nation, 143:467, October 24, 1936, "Landon is Losing the Middle West," Paul W. Ward) Others, of course, were fighting Roosevelt with the payroll device.
"Americans of all parties and all faiths" as having struggled for a goal together in 1932 was powerful in its invitation to return to the group. This invitation was strengthened by the return to the figure of the army on crusade with the assertion that there are "millions of new recruits," a prediction which Roosevelt was no doubt entitled to make through Chairman Farley's close contact with leaders in all parts of every state.

The conclusion of this graphic explanation was given in a cryptic sentence which declares an identity not justified in the light of the eleven million still unemployed, in the light of the drought-stricken areas, as Roosevelt's opponents were quick to notice. Roosevelt would have been more accurate with a declaration of progress made, and also more consistent with his stand that the crusading army was still "on the march." This term--"record"--had gained significance throughout the campaign; for example, two nights before, Landon had used the old Al Smith slogan, "Let's look at the record," in his address at Madison Square Garden.

67 "Their hopes have become our record."
This achievement has been a struggle

Delineation of the struggle took the form of a vigorous attack upon the twelve years of Republican administration. By compact, strong characterization, Roosevelt prepared the audience for the declaration that a return of the Republicans to office would mean a return of that type of government. 69 The President described Republican

69 Landon, of course, had repeatedly declared that the relief payments promised by the New Deal would not be abandoned (as in his Cleveland address of October 12, 1936, when he said of America's needy unemployed, "They are entitled to ample relief for their needs, and I shall see that they get it," [New York Times, October 13, 1936]) but Roosevelt had answered that the Republican candidate's promises of relief and of reduction of expenditures were inconsistent promises, as in his reference to the two-faced Roman god in his address in Denver, October 12, 1936. The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. V, p. 449.

administration as "hear-nothing, see-nothing, do-nothing government"; 70 he pictured the people as looking

70 The suggestion of the old phrase "hear no evil--see no evil--speak no evil" was probably too faint in this passage to be clearly apprehended by the hearers; by Roosevelt's prolonged utterance of the words their attention was directed to the peculiar aptness, in his line of thinking, of this rounded characterization to the Hoover government.

"to government" and the government looking "away," expressing the latter element with a fading, wavering voice inflection; finally he used three sentence-elements
which portrayed the nine years of prosperous living\textsuperscript{71} and

\textsuperscript{71}Despite tax reductions in 1926 and 1928 revenue receipts outran expectations and government surpluses accrued. Shultz, \textit{American Public Finance}, p. 644-645.

the three of depression. These final elements were delivered with a sustained tone which centered the condemnation upon the contrast being uttered; special inflection, as on the word "crazy," brought attention to its particular meaning. Choice of words in this continued contrast was effective in its swift, vivid characterization of both the happenings and the resultant moods.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{72}The first contrast, "Nine mocking years with the golden calf and three long years of the scourge!", is vivid through its Biblical coloring; the second contrast, "Nine crazy years at the ticker and three long years in the breadlines!", is powerful through its appeal to the drive for self-preservation; the third contrast, "Nine mad years of mirage and three long years of despair!", is strong through its suggestion of hope ended with defeat.

The use of the familiar salutation, "my friends," in this reference to the struggle being made to restore that kind of government reinforced the idea of identification between army and leader in the crusade.

Roosevelt's reuse of the phrase "three long years" in this striking passage was implicit refutation of Senator Steiwer's use of the same phrase at the Republican
Senator Steiwer's quotation of the phrase from a Roosevelt speech of 1933 (a request to Congress for authority to effect drastic economies in government, March 10, 1933, The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. II, p. 49) had set the Republican Convention of June, 1936, to chanting the words; later they found a place in a campaign song. The Senator had asked a series of questions regarding New Deal deficits, each of which he answered with this phrase. Vital Speeches, 2: 578, June 15, 1936, "Three Long Years."

Roosevelt avoided using the phrase "three years" in speaking of his own administration because he wished to turn from that contrast completely; instead he referred to that time as "nearly four years." The contrast

The danger of the continuing effect of strong figures of speech was pointed out by Walter Raleigh, Professor of English Literature at Liverpool University College: "The noblest...in proportion as they are strong and of a vivid presence, are also domineering--apt to assume command of the theme long after their proper work is done." Style, Edwin Arnold, London, 1898, p. 96.

between a government "twirling its thumbs," with the implication of ineffectuality, pomposity and weakness, and a government which "rolled up its sleeves," with its implication of earnest, sincere endeavor, was indeed vivid, and Roosevelt used its power to make his promise of future action impressive. To his opponents this promise of vigorous governmental action doubtless held all the threat of wide spending and Federal usurpation of function.
After this delineation of Democratic government by contrast, Roosevelt listed the "enemies of peace": "business and financial monopoly, speculation, reckless banking, class antagonism, sectionalism, war

The Securities Act of May 27, 1933, and the Glass-Steagall Banking Act of June 16, 1933, indicate the New Deal's early preoccupation with these problems. Rauch, op. cit., p. 82-83.

Hoover had asked Congress to establish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend federal money to banks, insurance companies, and other large enterprises, but had vetoed the Wagner-Gerner Relief Bill which would have given the power for loans to small businesses and individuals. Ibid., pp. 19-20.

Hoover failed to adopt plans for curtailment of agricultural production although leading farm spokesmen begged for such action. Ibid., p. 15. It began to be felt that the Hoover government was interested only in the Eastern business section of the country.

The power of this growing concentration of wealth over government was emphasized by characterization of government as "a mere appendage" and by declaring "organized money" as dangerous as "organized mob".

Roosevelt had pointed out in his Worcester address of ten days before that the Republican administrations had cut the income taxes on the high income brackets, thus favoring the wealthy classes. It is true that the normal individual rate was reduced from a graduated 6-12% to 5% in 1926, whereas the maximum surtax rate was
dropped from 65% to 20% in 1928. Buehler, Public Finance, p. 531.

Whereas Roosevelt's welcome to the hatred of these forces, Roosevelt's bodyguard, Michael F. Reilly, related this declaration to the booing of the President in the financial districts of New York a few days before; he stated that Roosevelt laughed at this greeting. Op. cit., p. 101.

a declaration which might have been called forth by his recent booing in New York, might have constituted strong ethical appeal through the loyalty of his partisans, yet it was open capitulation to the charge of fomenting class hatred. A reaction of greater stature lay in his assertion that he wished to have it said of him that these forces "met their match" in his first administration and "met their master" in his second. The incident of the pass-key to the White House, was introduced almost as comic relief after his strong declaration of purpose; its colloquial words and conversational tone were consistent
with the slightness of the subject. 82

82 Many of Roosevelt's critics, however, would not have allowed him this argument -- that he had kept free from the influence of other persons of strong purpose -- for they felt that the "brain-trusters" had undue access to the President. For example, Al Smith had declared in his radio address of October 1, 1936, "The bills were drawn by the brain-trust in the White House...." Vital Speeches, 3:17, October 15, 1936, "I am an American Before I am a Democrat."

Roosevelt's disparagement of the pay-envelope campaign, made before his direct attack upon it, took the form of characterization of the type of men who would have stooped to foster such a device, 83 a charge of inconsistent

83 This device caused the tactics to seem even farther removed from praiseworthy action. Roosevelt's description of the campaign as "against America's working people" tacitly recognized the identification of his administration and its program with the welfare of the workers.

stand as taken by these forces, 84 and an analogy between

84 Once condemning the New Deal for destroying "the American system", they now "undermine" it by this attempt at coercion. The President may well have been referring to Detroit industrialists, among whom the pay-envelope campaign started. The President's speech there on October 15, claiming that relief dollars had helped increase the purchase of Detroit's automobiles, had brought protests from such leaders as the head of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, the secretary of the Board of Commerce and the president of the Hudson Motor Car Company, each claiming credit for the recovery as belonging to industry. (New York Herald Tribune, October 17, 1936) W. J. Cameron, spokesman for the Ford Motor Company, declared over the Ford Sunday Evening Hour on October 25, 1936, that private initiative had built industry, referred
to the NRA as "that reactionary idea", and condemned deductions from workers' payrolls. Vital Speeches, 3:96, November 15, 1936. "Horse and Buggy Age."

this coercion of the worker to take a political position and the old threat to close the factory to make him take the desired political position. Roosevelt had thus shown the gullibility of workers who were deluded by this coercion.

Setting up the contention that this propaganda was not only coercive but deceitful, Roosevelt pointed out omissions which made the statement deceitful, closing

85 One omission was that the employer made an equal contribution to the old-age fund, another that the employer paid both parts to the unemployment insurance fund, and then the summary that the employer really "puts up three dollars -- three for one." If one considers that the employer puts up two dollars for the unemployment insurance, since the employee pays none, then the illustration is correct. The President's explanation was valid. Groves, op. cit., pp. 373-74.

each explanation with some form of the ringing refrain, "And that omission is deceit."

The third charge made upon the pay-envelope campaign was that its implication of Congressional diversion of funds was an attack upon "the integrity and the honor of American Government itself." His suggestion of emigration for these "aliens to the spirit of American democracy" was an evasion of the argument, an appeal to the basic
drives of indignation and prestige of his audience. 86

This fallacious answer does not do justice to the real attitude held toward the tentative nature of the Social Security Act. John G. Winant, the chairman of the board, had said on March 30, 1936, "There is no finality either in the Act or in our plans for its administration." Vital Speeches, 2:490, May 4, 1936, "The Social Security Act." He reiterated the possibility of "many and important changes" in his answer to Governor Landon's attack on the Act. It has been suggested that Winant, a studious reader of the Congressional Record, may have been concerned over the temptation afforded political raiders by the concentration of reserves. Newsweek, 8:10-12, October 10, 1936, "Security: Texas appraises cost...."

Fourth, Roosevelt condemned the whole pay-envelope attempt as "fraudulent" and "last-minute", pointing to the Republican votes the Act had received in Senate and House. This refutation, by questioning the consistency of the Republican stand, was forceful in its logic and was concluded with a finality of tone which suggested the weight of the argument.

Finally, the President pointed out the threat which such coercion would become to "honest business", declaring to his hearers that "the vast majority of law-abiding business men" fully appreciate the danger. This enlistment of small business to the Democratic stand was similar to the overtures made in the Chicago address of October 14, 1936, and the radio address to business men
on October 23, 1936.

The declaration of "indignation at this form of campaigning" was forceful through its understatement; his linking of all three elements -- employers, workers, general public -- in the group sharing such a sentiment, and his expression of confidence in their action at the polls were strong elements of pathetic appeal in their identification of speaker and hearers. The conclusion of this argument on the Social Security Act was lifted to a higher plane by restatement of his introductory claim that the "sole thought is the welfare of the United States of America."

The Administration has just begun to fight for many objectives

Roosevelt's introductory remark to his statement of objectives proclaimed his national view of the Presidency. 87 as his reason for confidence that the people

87 This idea is reminiscent of Theodore Roosevelt, who had been quoted by both major candidates in this campaign. (Landon had referred to him in the Pittsburgh address of October 27, 1936, New York Times, October 28, 1936; Franklin Roosevelt had referred to him in his Chicago address of October 14, 1936) Theodore Roosevelt had said at a banquet in Dallas, Texas, on April 5, 1905, "No man is fit to hold the position of President of the United States at all unless as President he feels that he represents no party but the people as a whole." Presidential Addresses and State Papers, The Review of Reviews Company, New York, 1910, Vol. III, p. 320.

want the continuation of his policy rather than
promises. Roosevelt further prefaced his extended

This assessment of his accomplishment as based upon his national view was essentially correct: his extension of Federal and of presidential power were derivatives; his balancing of the interests within the country stemmed from this view; his wide travel and face-to-face inspection of problems were both cause and result.

A recital of the record of the New Deal with two disparaging attacks against the Republicans -- that they have only promises to offer the nation; that they have been silent about their own goals. Landon had made it impossible

The first was the inherent position of a contender for power, but the second was only partially true. In Landon's speech at Indianapolis on October 24, 1936, he had clarified his stand on the World Court and the League of Nations, and had made suggestions for world trade. (New York Times, October 25, 1936). On the other hand, about many problems he had been vague, as in his reference to a source for social security payments; he suggested that they "be obtained from a direct and specific tax widely distributed." (New York Times, October 30, 1936). The whole Republican campaign had been an attack upon the Roosevelt administration rather than a constructive delineation of their own policies.

for Roosevelt to close the campaign without some statement of plans to be carried out in a second term by insisting that evasion would fall short of the President's duty and would show a lack of faith and confidence in the American people, an interpretation which Roosevelt could not

Speaking at Madison Square Garden forty-eight hours earlier, Landon had declared: "Here once again I
ask him to speak what is in his mind.... The people of this country will not trust a man who does not trust them. If he trusts them he will answer the questions being asked from one of the country to the other." 
Ibid., October 30, 1936.

let occur. 91

91——eit's relationship of confidence with the pe7 Rooseveltsic to his policy of experimentation; he could not allow even a weak opponent to question that relationship. Charles W. Hurd had pointed out, "President Roosevelt in his campaign for reelection has assumed the role of salesman for a single commodity -- confidence. Confidence in economic recovery, in social security, in business stability -- that is what he is trying to sell as he campaigns energetically up and down the country." New York Times Magazine, September 27, 1936, p. 5, "As Roosevelt Does It."

Each of the groupings of individual goals sought was begun with the words, with slight variation, "Of course, we will continue," the asperity of words and voice suggesting that the continuation of these benefits was not to be rightfully questioned. Roosevelt called the roll of the activities of his administration as he listed efforts made, and to be made, for the betterment of working conditions for labor and business relationships; of American home-life; of the farmers; of the needy unemployed; of youth and special groups; and "a multitude of things like these." Each of these groupings, except that of the unemployed, he closed with the refrain (in slightly varying form), "And for these things we have only just begun
At the mention of unemployment — the problem

to fight." At the mention of unemployment — the problem

Roosevelt's life-long interest in the sea and its
history made this quotation of John Paul Jones' famous
cry a compelling one for him. It should be recalled that
in August, 1934, when Lewis Douglas had resigned as Di-
rector of the Budget, Roosevelt declared with great em-
phasis, "In the words of John Paul Jones, we have not yet
begun to fight." Colliers, 120:11-13, September 27, 1947,
"The Fight to Balance the Budget," Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

upon which the Roosevelt record was most vulnerable —
Roosevelt broke the parade of the agencies to strike at
the Republicans. He inferred that his opponents proposed
a "dole," but his claim of disparaging remarks about the

Landon had outlined the Republican position on
relief in his Cleveland address of October 12, 1936. He
favored State and local handling and declared, "They will
determine what if any work-relief projects will be started
or continued." His statement that "I am opposed to the
use of relief labor, at relief wages, for the construction
of Federal public works" aimed at the separation of public
works from the administration of relief rather than at
the dole. New York Times, October 13, 1936. Roosevelt's
claim is overdrawn here.

unemployed, which he contrasted to the Democratic "Good
Samaritan" attitude as he had done in the Pittsburgh ad-
dress, could not rightfully have applied to Landon. And

Landon had declared, "Our people want to stand on
their own feet. I do not agree for a moment with those
who say that a large group of our fellow citizens prefer
relief to honest work." Ibid.

Roosevelt's charge that the authors of such remarks wanted
"to end relief -- to purge the rolls by starvation" had been made by no responsible Republican leader.

These objectives, each representative of an act or attitude taken during Roosevelt's administration, were individually powerful to the groups who had benefited by them, as the NYA to the youth, the Rural Electrification Administration to the farmers, water conservation -- through the construction of Fort Peck and many other dams -- to the people of those areas, slum clearance under projects of the Public Works Administration to the city dwellers. But the cumulative power of the whole recital was also strong, and was pointed up by Roosevelt's iteration of his refrain, a slogan which kept before the audience the continuity of the program. This insistence on continued efforts along the same successful lines was implicit refutation of the need for a statement of objectives as well as a bid for mandate to go forward with them.

The nation will seek peace

Strong retrospective force in the opening words of the conclusion turned the cumulative power of the

95 "All this -- all these objective..."

speech to the basic theme, that the people in 1932 and in
1936 desired peace. Roosevelt's argument that removal of the "causes of unrest and antagonism at home" tended toward peace with the world because it rendered our people less open to propaganda was the theme of his acceptance address of June 27, 1936, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. That he specified the propaganda as that of war profiteers was a restriction of the possible argument in order that he might draw the line more clearly between the friends and the foes of the New Deal.

96 This differentiation of support was effective refutation of Landon's claim in his Indianapolis speech of October 24, 1936, on planning to cut down war profits. New York Times, October 25, 1936.

Roosevelt's elevation of the problem to the high plane of religious devotion, 97 which would give the

97 Frances Perkins, who had worked with Roosevelt closely enough both in New York State and in Washington, D. C., to know his faith, pointed out that he turned naturally to religion in his struggle to improve life for the people of the country. Op. cit., p. 143.

nation "a sense of justice and of moral purpose," was strong pathetic proof; it seemed to relegate politics and business, with the turmoil which they involve, to
their proper plane and to focus attention upon the source of true power. That accord within the nation depends upon such devotion and that the recovery being won is aiming at the "justice and love and humility" of the prophet's creed serve to fit the Roosevelt program (for those who accept its tenets) into the pattern of a high crusade. The final sentence, with its strong iteration of the word "that," rounds out the theme to show that the Roosevelt way is "the road to peace," and thus the answer to the request of the people.

**Summary and Interpretation**

On October 31, Roosevelt closed his active campaign for reelection to the Presidency with an impassioned address delivered in Madison Square Garden at Tammany Hall's annual rally. Addressing an audience of 20,000 listeners within the hall, other thousands outside hearing by loudspeakers, and a radio audience of uncounted numbers, Roosevelt made a fiery attack upon the pay-envelope campaign and outlined the objectives of his administration.

October had brought the development of a vigorous last-minute attack upon the Social Security Act of 1935. Started by industrialists in Detroit and sponsored among large groups of workers there and in
other sections by Republican adherents, the plan attempted to arouse laborers against Roosevelt by emphasizing the deductions which the Act would begin on January 1, 1937, to claim from their wages. The Democrats were truly alarmed by the rapid spread of this attack and began a vigorous defense of the Act by newspaper and radio. Roosevelt himself took occasion again and again to explain the security program of his administration.

Other factors compelling attention at this time were the increasing imminence of war in Europe, and repeated Republican demands for a clear definition of principles by the President.

Although the swing of public favor toward Roosevelt had been pretty well assured by late October, loss of public confidence in him, however it might be brought about, was a real danger. When Roosevelt stood before the strongly partisan audience in Madison Square Garden, he addressed also, by radio, listeners fearful of involvement in European turmoil, others disturbed by the pay-envelope campaign, and, certainly, ones who desired a careful analysis of Democratic plans for the future.

**Ideas and Logical Proofs**

Keying his entire address to peace within
and without the nation, Roosevelt declared that the preservation of the "democracy" which had been "restored" in 1932 by warring on "economic inequality" was the main issue in 1936. He pointed out the speculators and the monopolists as the major threat. He argued that the present threat was taking the form of an attempt at coercion and deceit of workers through the pay-envelope campaign. The President reiterated the objectives of his administration as policies to be continued to bring the desired peace.

Roosevelt's picture, frequently given, of the plight of the people in the depression was presented in this address by specifying the "fears" of 1932 and the groups who had wished to substitute "peace of mind" for these fears, a valid argument and one effective in the campaign for its emphasis upon the wide-flung groups who had been helped by the New Deal.

As in the Philadelphia address, Roosevelt analyzed the struggle as that of government against monopoly and speculation, a fight which the Republicans had not undertaken. Whereas, in the previous address, he had condemned the general policies of the "economic royalists," in this speech he attacked the specific manifestation of this danger in the pay-envelope campaign. In contrast to the Philadelphia ac-
dress, but consistent with the method adopted in his Chicago and Worcester speeches, he differentiated between these monopolists, whose "hatred" he welcomed, and the "vast majority of law-abiding business men," who condemned these policies as he did. His attack on the pay-envelope issue was compelling both in the directness of its charges of coercion and deceit and in the pertinency of his explanation that such a policy endangered honest business and questioned the judgment of Republicans who had voted for the Social Security Act.

Roosevelt's recital of the objectives for which his administration had "just begun to fight," made, no doubt, in answer to Landon's demands for the definition of his purposes, was the presentation again of the activities of his government for the welfare of the people. The cumulative power of the picture was strong. As in the Philadelphia address, he declared that the basis of his administration had been a religious one and that his struggle had been waged, not only for economic ends, but for the high goals of the nation. The speech thus concentrated the power of the whole attack upon monopoly on the specific pay-envelope issue and then keyed in the administration's policies with the objective of peace for the nation.
**Ethical proofs.**

The strongest ethical proof afforded in this address by Roosevelt's reputation was that of his declaration of the monopolists' hatred for him. Implicit in their hatred lay the record of effective past action taken against them. The extended list of his actions for social welfare pointed also to his reputation as the nation's thoughtful and effective leader.

The hatred of the moneyed interests for Roosevelt stamped him, in the eyes of his Madison Square Garden audience and, undoubtedly, in those of most of his radio listeners, as a "good man." His declaration of the invulnerability of the White House to monopolistic influences during his administration continued this proof.

No strong bid for the good-will of the audience by detailed recital of the activities of the New Deal in bringing recovery had been made in the Philadelphia address; the method was used to some extent in the Syracuse, Pittsburgh and Worcester speeches but in close connection with the specific problem under consideration; however, in the Omaha, Chicago and Madison Square Garden addresses, Roosevelt brought this power of appeal for good-will into prominence.
Basic to the whole address was Roosevelt's assumption that the people were with him—not only those who had supported the New Deal from its beginning, but others who had now learned to appreciate its goals; the general public who, with him, felt "indignation" at the pay-envelope method of campaigning.

Roosevelt's demonstration of concern for the welfare of wide groups, with its underlying purpose of giving aid in good spirit where aid was needed, was strong appeal to the fundamental drive of self-preservation. Both in the Worcester speech and in the Madison Square Garden address, the President put forth clearly the efforts his administration had made for the welfare of the many groups of people in our structure. In this address, as in the one at Philadelphia, he tied in the economic struggle with the high goals of the nation, lifting the issue above selfishness and attaching it to the highest motives of citizens. This enhancement of the idea was a motivative appeal frequently found in the conclusions of Roosevelt's addresses.

Arrangement

The ordering of the ideas in this address was effective: it illustrated well the power gained by gathering the weight of a general argument, pre-
viously made and here repeated, and concentrating it in attack upon a specific issue. Roosevelt marshalled his attack upon monopoly and concentrated his attack, in addition, upon the pay-envelope campaign.

Significant use of effective arrangement was also made in the listing of Democratic objectives. Repetition in opening phrase and refrain separated the otherwise bewildering array of details into compact groups of cumulative power. The method and purpose were similar to those used in the Chicago address, but the grouping of details and the use of refrain was more decisively employed in this speech.

Language

Concrete words, parallelism, colloquial language, rhetorical questions—these effective language usages were employed in this address as in others of the campaign. In no other speech of the campaign, however, did excellence in words and form, concentrating upon one strong contrast, produce a passage of such effectiveness as in the attack upon "hear-nothing, see-nothing, do-nothing government" in this address.

The key of the language in the Madison Square Garden address was more nearly similar to that of the Philadelphia speech than any other; in addition, the
general key of the whole was interrupted by a section of light bantering, in the incident of the White House pass-key, a method of contrasted styles, used also in the "nice old gentleman" episode of the Syracuse speech. In no other address was direct quotation of the Scriptures made so integral a part. Thus, language played an important share in making this address a vigorous political document.

**Delivery**

The confidence of a winning candidate was displayed in the delivery of this address; more surprising, however, were the pugnacity in the pay-envelope argument and the violence of welcome to the "hatred" of the monopolists, outbursts of feeling which his enemies claimed to have demonstrated his weakness and many of his supporters thought unnecessary, but which the Democratic partisans in Madison Square Garden regarded as evidence of strength and determination.

His ideas, arrangement, language and delivery had raised the enthusiasm of the audience to such a pitch that twice they interrupted his idea before he had reached its climax; at one time, he lifted his voice above the din and completed the statement; at
another, he requested them to "wait a minute" and proceeded to his conclusion. He had been faced, throughout the campaign, with the problem of applause which obscured the beginnings of his sentences or phrases; he had employed the method of repeating these words in much the same fashion as he had first uttered them without any show of hurrying the audience. His characteristic confidence in meeting the demands of a speaking situation and of using its possibilities to their fullest was displayed more clearly in no way than in his delivery; delivery served the purpose well in this address, as it had in every speech of the campaign.

Thus, Roosevelt closed his campaign much as he had begun it: the theme—America needs Democratic leadership to win economic liberty; the methods of demonstration of the theme—comparison between results of Republican and Democratic leadership, and specification of benefits brought by the latter. Throughout the campaign the President had avoided a defensive position, and in this final speech he upheld the Social Security Act by vigorously attacking the pay-envelope campaign. Nevertheless, the tone of this address was definitely sharper than that of the opening speech, as perhaps might be expected before the election settled the basic issue of the "hard-fought" campaign.
Reactions to the Speech

Although Roosevelt's immediate audience of Tammany followers received his address with great applause, news comment centered upon the violence of his

98Throughout his half-hour address Mr. Roosevelt was repeatedly interrupted with applause and cheers, frequently mingled with booing for those he denounced as enemies of the people. At times the applause came after almost every paragraph; occasionally it punctuated sentences and even phrases.

"During his impassioned attack upon the moneyed forces, whom he put in the van of his foes, the opposition rose to such heights and was so prolonged as to become a miniature ovation in itself. He stopped it once with the words, "Wait a minute!" until he had finished a promise to master these forces in his second term.

"The President was in his best oratorical form..."

New York Times, November 1, 1936.

attack. Pointing out his "bitter tones", the Newsweek editorial writer drew the comparison, "Not since his opening campaign speech at Syracuse had Roosevelt shown such combativeness." 99 Raymond Moley, who had assisted

99Newsweek, 8:8, November 7, 1936, "Election: Landslide Gives Roosevelt Four More Years..."

in the preparation of the Philadelphia address, but none of the later addresses, because of the widening gulf between his viewpoint and that of Roosevelt, declared that the President's speeches became "increasingly emotional" during October and stated that Roosevelt "had succumbed
completely to the heady spell he was creating." Moley contended that the certainty of an overwhelming victory at the polls should have been "his instinct for moderation" in the Madison Square Garden Address, but that "Thoughtful citizens were stunned by the violence, the bombast, the naked demogoguery of those sentences." 100

100 Moley was referring in particular to the sentences beginning at this point, "We had to struggle with the old enemies of peace -- business and financial monopoly, speculation..." After Seven Years, p. 352.

Another point of violent attack was mentioned in the comment that the President "excoriated Republican administrations in biting terms. Doing so, he turned the 'three long years' refrain of Senator Frederick Steiwer in his keynote speech at the Republican National Convention back upon his opponents." 101 Dorothy Thompson pointed out that Roosevelt had conducted his campaign preceding this address "with a minimum of trickery and the maximum of good humor and geniality"; however, she strongly censured the Madison Square Garden address for its violence and lack of constructiveness. 102

102 "The Madison Square Garden speech was not good-tempered, it was not tolerant, it was not fair, it was
not uplifting, it was not even revolutionary. It showed anger, vindictiveness, and a lack of poise which was disturbing. Worst of all, it was not in the least constructive.... It seems now quite certain that the President has worked himself up to the point where he believes that a mystical contact exists between him personally and the American people.... It is too bad that Mr. Roosevelt's campaign should have ended on the worst note of his career, that he should have shown himself under the most unpleasant and pettiest side of his complex nature." New York Herald Tribune, November 2, 1936.

A result of this address that was perhaps more important than the adverse criticism of these writers was the lifting of certain of these passages from their context, such phrases as "organized money," "met their match," and "welcome their hatred." "These remarks taken from their context were reported to have alienated many Northeastern voters who were preparing to vote for the President." 103

103"The campaign ended with a great deal of money being spent by the Republicans to hammer these words home with as much sinister implication as both fact and fancy could furnish." New York Times, November 4, 1936, Arthur Krock.

Both Landon and Roosevelt spoke in their Monday evening radio talks of the duties of citizenship, the need for a united country, and the greater interest evinced in the election. Landon declared,

It is the basic principle of our form of government that the issues may be left
with safety to the tribunal of the people
.... I am confident that the people understand the issues before them in this election. 104

104 Ibid., November 3, 1936.

Roosevelt asserted,

This year they have thought things through to a point where the eternal simplicities mean more than the fuzz-buzz of technical talk. They know that the important thing is the spirit in which government will face problems as they come up, and the values it will seek to preserve or to enhance. (105)


Each speaker referred to ideas from his Madison Square Garden address, but neither mentioned his opponent.

With the consensus of observers declaring a significant majority in the election for Roosevelt, 106 with Hearst and the Literary Digest still declaring for Landon, discussion turned forward rather than back at this point, except in areas where the Social Security act was under fire and defense.
CONCLUSIONS

On November 3, 1936, nearly eight million more voters went to the polls than had ever before done so — about forty-five million persons, or some sixty per cent of the citizens of twenty-one years or over in the United States. Of these, Roosevelt won a popular vote of 27,751,000 to Landon's 16,682,000, and the electoral vote of all the States except Landon's Maine and Vermont, a total of 525 to 8. Although his popular majority had been equalled at certain previous elections, never had a candidate, in an election when two parties were supporting two separate tickets, received so great an electoral majority.¹

¹Rauch, op. cit., pp. 262-64.

Why was Roosevelt returned to the Presidency in 1937 by the choice of the majority in every section of the country? Among the reasons are these: he was walking in the direction in which history was moving the nation; the incidence of recovery put strong weapons in his hands; he was able, in one of the greatest stump-speaking campaigns of all time, to deepen and to rebuild, where necessary,
the faith of the majority in his leadership toward the
goals which he envisioned for the country.

The Issues of the Campaign

Roosevelt himself was the issue in the campaign of 1936. There was no other real issue, regardless of the attempts of the Republican strategy-makers to establish others. Those who directed publicity for the Democratic party began with the theory "that the correct strategy was to insure, if possible, that the candidate of the opposition should not be built up to an inspiring figure."\(^2\) And


the campaign narrowed to one decision—not between support of Roosevelt or support of Landon, but between support of, or opposition to, Roosevelt. The minor parties, which had mushroomed in the spring of 1936, failed of their promise through the singleness of issue in the campaign.

The Republicans, as challengers, should have taken the offensive, driving Roosevelt to a defense of the policies of his administration. In this campaign, however, the incumbents became the challengers, constantly enforcing the comparison—with the powerful aid of the nation's recovery—between the New Deal years and the preceding
Republican administrations, and never allowing the Republicans to consider the Roosevelt administration as a single factor.

The campaign had opened with the delineation of party platforms, differing on few points, primarily these: the selection of governmental agency to provide relief; the management of surplus products; the source of revenue for old age benefits. The Republican platform closed with this declaration: "We offer the abiding security of a government of laws against the autocratic perils of a government of men." The platform of the Democrats asserted in closing:

The issue in this election is plain. The American people are called upon to choose between a Republican Administration that has and would again regiment them in the service of privileged groups and a Democratic Administration dedicated to the establishment of equal opportunity for all our people.

The basic lines of the clash which took place between June and November, 1936, could be seen in these sentences. The Democrats discussed other issues only as they assumed prominence in the thinking of the electorate.
The Midwest drought brought the agriculture problem to the fore, and Roosevelt discussed it in Omaha, Nebraska, on October 10. Newspaper attacks and challenges by his opponents made Communism momentarily important, and Roosevelt discussed it in Syracuse, New York, on September 29.

Repeated criticism of his expenditures and conduct of monetary policies rendered government finance a significant issue, and Roosevelt spoke, in Pittsburgh, on October 1, on balancing the budget, and, in Worcester, Massachusetts, on October 21, on taxation. The pay-envelope campaign against the Social Security Act brought the integrity of the whole Democratic administration in question, and Roosevelt took up the issue at the final Democratic rally at Madison Square Garden on October 31.

The Democrats also discussed issues involving the grouping of forces which the plan of their campaign indicated; on June 27 in Philadelphia, Roosevelt attacked the monopolists, and on October 14 in Chicago, he made an overture to small business men.

But this discussion of specific issues, made necessary by their prominence in the public mind or by the strategy of the campaign, was accessory to the presentation of the basic contrast between Democratic recovery and Republican depression. In no one of the seven major
addresses from June to November did Roosevelt neglect strong statement of this contrast.

To other issues Roosevelt made no reply; some were answered by other Democratic speakers, others were ignored. The most significant omission was that of the restoration of the principles of the NRA; nor could his opponents press him into discussion of the Civil Service, the unemployed, or the peace issues. The Supreme Court's decision invalidating the New York minimum-wage law had weakened, by its seeming opposition to social trends, Republican defense of the Court and had removed the issue from the campaign.

Whereas all campaigns are based, to some extent, on the candidates rather than the specific issues, the campaign of 1936 was primarily concerned with the personality and the principles of one of the candidates, Franklin D. Roosevelt. In this type of campaign, with its problem mainly that of ethical proof, the gathering of great crowds for inter-stimulation would help, the appearance of the candidate in doubtful areas at a time to foil his opponent skilfully would be important, the careful maintenance of favorable attitudes among the electorate and the dispelling of unfavorable ones would be basic to success. These factors Roosevelt had to assess and control
in the 1936 campaign, one of his major tools was his presentation of seven campaign addresses, heard in face-to-face situations by thousands, and over the loud-speakers and radio systems by millions.

**The Major Campaign Addresses**

**Ideas and logical proofs**

The principal theme of the campaign was that his administration had brought recovery from the distress into which Republican administrations had allowed the country to fall, and would continue the fight for the "greater good of the greater number," which had been so well begun.

Roosevelt had declared before the electorate that he should be returned to the Presidency, because under his administration these things had been or were being done:

1. economic freedom was being won through regulation of big business;
2. conditions conducive to the growth of Communism had been eliminated;
3. governmental borrowing necessary to have brought recovery was being paid out of increased returns;
4. recovery had been won for the farmers, and future plans aimed for their security and opportunity;
(5) recovery had been won for business through governmental promotion of private enterprise;
(6) democracy in taxation was being achieved through adjustments on the basis of ability to pay;
(7) democracy was being restored through victories over the "selfish forces" of monopoly.

Throughout these lines of argument, which reflected the advances made during his administration, Roosevelt reasoned that, since the present Republican leadership was really the same leadership as before, election of his opponent would mean the return of conditions and dangers which had existed in the previous Republican administrations.

Basic throughout the campaign was the comparison of the struggle for recovery with actual warfare, specifically, in the Philadelphia and Worcester addresses, to the Revolutionary War. This analogy provided the framework for his explanation of the cost of recovery, for his enlistment of all citizens in the cause, for retention of himself as the successful leader in a struggle not yet completely won.

Clear exposition and specific examples, either related or named only, were the two most frequently used
forms of logical proof. Both aimed directly at the listener's understanding by placing the ideas graphically within his experience. The use of statistics gave validity to the Pittsburgh address on the budget issue; and this form of support was used, to a lesser extent, in explaining, in the Worcester speech, his democratization of the tax structure.

The most serious weakness in Roosevelt's argument lay in his distortion of the picture by omission of necessary factors and concentration upon the one or ones suiting his purpose. Such a fallacy in reasoning was likely to attend the simplification of problems for the understanding of the millions of listeners; nevertheless, it was not to be condoned in the reasoning of one who held that the nation must move forward through the education of the people in things political.

Roosevelt's desire to touch the understanding of the listeners may also have been the source of another weakness in reasoning, the subtle one of overstatement or understatement. To condemn him for this practice would be to have required unattainable standards of semantic exactness from him; yet, when such designation became a strong element in the fabric of his proof, it became subject to the rules of validity in logical reasoning and thus fallacious through factual and logical inconsistency.
That the issue of the campaign was indeed single was clearly evidenced by the fact that Roosevelt's conclusions were acceptable or unacceptable, not so much on the basis of the reasoning done or the facts used as on the basis of the premises from which he started. If the listeners believed that government must be empowered to do whatever the people needed, and in seeking these goals might proceed by experimentation rather than by previously accepted methods—they might believe Roosevelt's arguments and accept his conclusions; if they, on the other hand, held that the governmental sphere of action should be a limited one and that they must have the opportunity to choose, when selecting a leader, among specific methods of reaching national goals—they would deny his arguments and reject his conclusions. This campaign was truly a decision for or against Roosevelt and his premises.

Ethical proofs

The strongest proof offered throughout the campaign was personal or ethical in nature: Roosevelt, fearless President who had led the people through the crisis to recovery; Roosevelt, leader who dealt on equal terms with royalty in Europe and yet seemed honestly to enjoy his visits over the fences with Iowa farmers; Roosevelt, citizen who felt earnestly that every other citizen had a
right to a home, a job, some leisure time, and a respected place in society—this man speaking to millions in simple terms they understood and with homely examples that they appreciated. Of necessity, such ethical proof intensified the opposition of those who denied his principles and resented his popularity, but it brought the support of men in all occupations and in all sections of the country: it elected him in 1936.

Specific in this total effect were the references to matters and persons of local interest; the iteration of the salute, "my friends"; the enhancement of his own leadership through intellectual, moral, social and practical abilities; the identification of himself with others of like character— all good Democrats and common people; exclusion of the indicted foes—the "Royalists" and any who questioned the good faith of American government; evidences of attempt to make ideas clear to the listeners; and the impression of being thoroughly in command of the situation. The people felt the man in the speech, and they liked the man they felt, or disliked him, in intense fashion.

Pathetic proofs

Perhaps the strongest emotional or pathetic appeal in these addresses was made through the force of
empathy, the imaginative and sympathetic identification of the listeners with the power and personality of Roosevelt; the most average citizens felt themselves marching in the crusade, or fighting the drought with million dollar blows, or scorning those who would leave the country because their taxes had been raised. Roosevelt's audience marched with him in these addresses because he was reacting powerfully with phrase, word, voice, and, sometimes, gesture, to his ideas and attitudes.

In addition to this basic pathetic appeal was another, equally persistent and equally cogent. Through all of Roosevelt's addresses breathed his concern for the common man, a concern made evident by his pride in acts which had brought benefits, by his vigorous attacks against the common man's enemies, by his recognition of that man's right to understand and judge on matters and of his fairness in so doing. Such concern provided strong motivation whether the listener sat among the throng before Roosevelt, or at home beside his radio.

The kinetic component in Roosevelt's speeches was compelling to the listener; the ideas themselves, as well as their framing in words and sentences and their vocal utterance, were dynamic and forward-moving. Roosevelt was
an "enemy of tragedy," and a leader with visions—both

Ludwig, op. cit., p. 296

their desire for comradeship in a going venture.

These three forms of Aristotelian proof—logical, ethical and pathetic—obviously did not operate upon Roosevelt's audiences separately. The intellectual modes of expression were fused with high emotion and imagination, as was appropriate for addresses uttered in the final stages of a historic Presidential campaign. In Roosevelt's reasoning these three modes of address were not distinct; emotion integrated with thought to shape his conclusions and his loyalties. His superiority as a speaker arose from the fact that his facility with language and voice allowed these ideas, so arrived at, to assume their rightful stature before his audiences.

Arrangement

Roosevelt’s pattern of arrangement, though it varied widely in extent and specific form according to the purpose, seemed to comprise these three steps: first, centering attention on the problem in ways such as showing its universality, or pointing out its importance; second,
explaining and supporting the thesis; third, placing the immediate problem or solution in its relation to larger purposes or systems of thought.

In some addresses, as in the Philadelphia acceptance address, the use of partition and transitional elements was at a minimum, for the cumulative power of the whole brought the impact of the thesis upon the listeners; in others, as in the Syracuse speech, these elements identified steps in a line of reasoning by which the audience arrived at a conclusion distant from the starting-point. The arrangement was inherent in the material and the occasion.

**Language**

Roosevelt did not think in vague formulas and general terms, but in specific examples. Similarly, in speaking, he addressed the individual, and made ideas and attitudes real to him with concrete words and imagery; with sentence structure that showed the relative power of ideas and their conditioning effect upon each other; with repetition of introductory element, and with refrain. Characterization achieved by epithet and by attributive or appositional modifier gave Roosevelt a high degree of power in disparagement or praise, and caused his opponents at times to answer his words more forcefully than his arguments.
The echo of fine literature heard in Roosevelt's speeches, both in the words quoted and in the similarity of phrasing or rhythm, did not demean his own language by superiority to it, but rather emphasized the merit of his expression. The Wilsonian flavor, the Biblical expressions, the echoes of the Gettysburg Address and Declaration of Independence—these and similar stylistic patterns seemed suited to the key of his own words.

Roosevelt met several of the problems of the speaking situation by facility in language. Because the manuscripts from which he read these addresses (all seven were presented both to a face-to-face audience and to a radio audience) were the product of his own repeated revision of his ideas and those of his aides, because he had the facility of reading with but a glance at the page, because he was able to improvise easily if he misread or was interrupted by applause—for these reasons his prepared addresses had all the liveliness of spontaneous speech and all the power of planned speech.

Delivery

The conclusion that Roosevelt's voice was the one cause of his effectiveness in speaking, as many have casually asserted, overlooked the fact that flexibility and excellent timbre of voice would not produce impressive
results on a wide variety of occasions without adaptation to the immediate situations of speaker, idea and audience. Such adaptation could not have been achieved without the active force of personality. That Roosevelt's adaptation was effected through excellent command of pitch, force, rate and quality gave his personality the wider scope. Thus, his hearers felt the warmth of regard for all persons expressed through the medium of his voice, but many, without analysis, attributed the warmth to his voice alone and neglected its truer basis.

Roosevelt used the aspects of voice to elicit applause with which he might consolidate an argument won, or intensify a charge made; he employed them to nurse a laugh, or to evoke one.

In the speeches of the campaign of 1932, Roosevelt suited his use of voice to the demands of the occasion; for example, he used a sustained, oratorical tone in his acceptance address to the 100,000 in Franklin Field; he guided the applause of his farm audience at Omaha by vocal usage; he used a more conversational tone of colloquial speech in his baseball address in Pittsburgh. Within the seven addresses, he varied from strong praise to bitter scorn, and from deep earnestness to light flippancy, by variations of voice. He pointed the climax, or impressed the contrast, or characterized the idea by significant use
of these aspects of voice, particularly of rate. And these variations of voice were effective because they represented the thinking and attitudes of the man who produced them.

Thus Roosevelt's speech-making in the campaign of 1936 was, indeed, a powerful factor in bringing his reelection to the Presidency.
ROOSEVELT'S SPEECH EXPERIENCES AT GROTON

Franklin D. Roosevelt attended Groton School in Massachusetts from 1896 to 1900, entering in the Third Form because of previous training by tutor and travel. Although his speech performances at Groton were neither numerous nor outstanding,\(^1\) they were important to him in their demands and their achievements.

Every Groton student participated in either the Junior or Senior Society. Both societies held weekly

\(^1\)Dr. E.B. Krumbhaar, although he felt that debates at Groton were "too far back to have clear recollections persist," declared, "However, I would feel pretty sure that he was not an outstanding speaker as compared to several others in our form, though at least an average debater and probably better." "Here, as in other school activities, I would say that Franklin's performance was an average one." Letter of February 1, 1948, to this writer from Dr. E.B. Krumbhaar. Dr. Krumbhaar, now a consulting psychopathologist at the Philadelphia General Hospital, was a school friend and competitor of Roosevelt's at both Groton and Harvard.

The renowned Groton Headmaster, Endicott Peabody, wrote in 1932 of Franklin Roosevelt to another graduate: "He was a quiet, satisfactory boy of more than ordinary intelligence, taking a good position in his Form but not brilliant....We all liked him. So far as I know that is true of the masters and boys alike..." Frank D. Ashburn, Peabody of Groton, Coward McCann, Inc., New York, 1944, p. 341.
meetings during the winter term. Two members were "pros" and two were "cons" on the proposition chosen for that

2This designation of the teams was used in a diary kept at the time by William P. Wharton, who copied out the following quotation in a letter of February 3, 1948, to this writer:

"Monday, March 6, 1899. In evening my debate comes off, question being: 'Resolved, that the United States and England should guarantee the integrity of China.' C. H. Krumhhaar and R. Derby are pros, and F. Roosevelt and myself are cons; we win, they getting but one vote I believe."

evening by the opposing teams. 3 In Roosevelt's first year

3However, in 1898 the Senior Society had such a large membership that each team was increased to three. The Grotonian, XIV: 7, January, 1898.

team assignments were determined alphabetically; in his second year, by lot. 4

4Early Years, p. 156.

The prepared speeches were followed by two-minute impromptu rebuttals by members of the club. Dr. Krumhhaar pointed out that "The prepared speeches were less inviting than the impromptu rebuttals, though the latter were more apt to have less content value, as was natural." 5 In

general, "More attention was given to arguments than to
the manner of presentation." Lathrop Brown, friend of

6. Ibid.

Roosevelt at Groton and Harvard, declared that the
Debating Societies

"served as a guide as to where needed facts
could be found and explained the why of
libraries other than as collections of books
of adventure. The critical faculty was
still undeveloped among the debaters." 7

7. Letter of October 17, 1947, to this writer.

The president of the society took charge of the
meeting; Roosevelt wrote, in a letter dated March 24, 1897,
to his parents, of an incident in which the chairman cut
a debater short and requested him not to "read his
speech." 8 Decision as to the winners of the debate was

8. Early Years, p. 78.

made by vote of the members of the club. Dr. Krumbhaar
pointed out

"Voting of course was supposed to be on the
merit of the performance, not on the pros
and cons of the question, and there was great
interest as to which side won.... Especially
in the Junior Society individual liking for
the speakers undoubtedly played a part." 9
In Roosevelt's first winter term, 1897, he was scheduled to debate on the twenty-second of March; a letter to February 28, 1897, to his parents revealed his planning for the occasion:

"The debate last Thursday was on the Nicaragua Canal Bill and I made a two-minute speech; I was rather nervous at first, but I want to get accustomed to it so as to be all right for my debate." 10

Two weeks later he wrote to tell them that the question was to be "Resolved that the U.S. increase the navy" and that he was a "pro." He added:

"Please send any points that you find no matter if they are on my side or not. I am going to write my speech out and then learn it off by heart. My speech is the first of the four and I think the sides are pretty even." 11
His letter of March 15 explained that his partner's father had sent some points, that the two boys "got a good many from the library," and that the points which his parents had sent were "valuable." Ibid., p. 74.

When the twenty-second came, Roosevelt and his partner read over their "debates" to themselves in the evening after school. He described the "exciting ordeal," to his parents:

Dr. Krumbhaar wrote of these society debates: "To most the evening was an exciting ordeal, more than a pleasure—though they realized that it was a valuable experience." Og. cit.

"I was not at all nervous in the chair as Goodrich and Goodwin debated first. Their debates were very good, only Goodwin did not speak his very well. My debate came next and lasted about 6 minutes and came out without a hitch....Over 30 votes were cast out of which our opponents received three." 13

The debates for this term were to end with a mock Nominating Convention.

The Grotonian, XIII: 90, February, 1897.
Roosevelt's Second Year

A stimulus for improved quality of the debate speeches came in the winter of 1898 when Dr. Coit of St. Paul's suggested an annual debate between the schools: although plans were uncompleted that year, hope was held out for such a contest the following year. However, no such interscholastic contest was held in 1899.

Comment in The Grotonian during the winter term of 1898 declared that many of the boys did not seem to realize the importance of a fair ballot; claimed that the members voted to aid their friends or for the side of the question with which they had sympathized before the debate; and urged them to judge from excellence of "the style, the strength, and the delivery."

In Roosevelt's second year of debating at Groton, he was placed by lot on the negative team in the first debate of the season. The debaters chose the subject: "Resolved, that Hawaii be promptly annexed." Roosevelt wrote to his parents on January 12, requesting that "If
you see any articles in the papers or the Spectator against the annexation of Hawaii I wish you could send them to me.” 17 The question of Hawaiian annexation was

being vigorously discussed in Congress and throughout the country at this time; formal annexation was accomplished some six months after the boy Roosevelt had attempted to show its inadvisability.

That Roosevelt put off having a tooth, which he had injured the previous summer at Campobello, pulled at this time because it might have interfered with his speaking in this debate18 is interesting in the light of

the subsequent replacement by the denture which had to be screwed in place before he delivered a speech.

Roosevelt delivered his "debate" from eight pages of pencil copy with stars and catch-words in the left margin to serve him as notes. His introduction took this form:

"Mr. President, Lady and Gentlemen. Of all the great powers of the world the United States and Russia are the only ones which have no
colonies to defend. All our territory
is on this continent and all of it except
Alaska is continuous.

"Therefore the United States and Russia
are the only two countries no part of whose
territory can be cut off by a naval enemy.
At present we have no really vulnerable
point. Now, the annexation of Hawaii by
us would affect the feelings of the European
powers in two ways: first it would anger
them because Hawaii is a common stopping
point, secondly it would embolden them
because we should for the first time in our
history have a vulnerable point."19

19Ibid., p. 160.

His use of Captain Alfred Mahan as an authority supporting
his position was undoubtedly effective, as Mahan had
published his famous book, The Influence of Sea Power Upon
History, 1660-1773, only eight years before and was at
this time writing numerous magazine articles. Roosevelt's
reference to "some foolish Senator" who had suggested that
the United States might later abandon the Islands showed
his awareness of newspaper reports of current Washington
happenings. The reprint of his manuscript shows an appeal
to "your American common-sense" marked through with oblique
pencil lines and a concluding sentence referring to his
opponent's lack of proof added.20 The Junior Society

20Ibid., p. 164.
voted Roosevelt and his partner the victors. 21 Other propositions chosen for debate that term concerned the protection of Alaskan seals and the sending of warships to Turkey to demand the indemnity due the United States. 22

21 The Grotonian, XIV: 91, February, 1898.

22 Ibid.

The following month, The Grotonian reported that Professor Ayrsult of the Groton faculty addressed the Senior Society on February 23, 1893:

"Mr. Ayrsult made a few remarks upon the character of the speeches usually delivered, and upon the advisability of speaking from notes, rather than from a fully written speech. Since then it has been decided that only short notes shall be used, and each speaker is provided with a card of a fixed size, so that he may bring in only what he is able to write on it." 23

23 Ibid., XIV: 112, March, 1898.

Although Roosevelt was not a member of the Senior Society at this time, he came under the influence of this policy the following year.

Roosevelt's Third Year

The school paper declared that the Debating
Societies had been a decided success in the winter term of 1899, not only in the care shown in the preparation of speeches but also in the general attitude toward the societies as bringing benefits from participation and attendance. Declared The Grotonian:

"This success may be attributed largely to the zeal shown by the presidents of the two societies in arousing a more lively interest among the individual members. The new rule, limiting the notes of the principal speakers to one side of a small block sheet, also contributed to the success, first, because more pains had to be taken in the preparation of the debates, as dependence on a written speech was impossible; secondly, because the debaters were compelled 'to think upon their feet.'"^{24}

^{24}XV: 104, March, 1899.

In the 1899 term Roosevelt was assigned to the negative of the chosen question, "Resolved, that the United States and England should guarantee the integrity of China." He was to debate with "Polly" Wharton, former president of the Junior Society and a boy whose intense interest in politics had given him his nickname,^{25} against the president of the Senior Society and another sixth former.

^{25}Early Years, p. 69.
one way or the other" and five days later expressed gratitude to his father:

"Thanks for the Spectator clipping; it is of great use to me and I have finished my speech and am learning it now."27

The votes of the Senior Society declared Wharton and Roosevelt the winners.28

Roosevelt's final year at Groton

Roosevelt, in his final year at Groton, took part in a different form of speaking; he played the part of a foolish cousin in the sixth-form's annual Washington's Birthday play, a role he had much desired.29

Roosevelt had written his parents for his father's old dress suit and a straw beaver from London and "anything that you can suggest for an old country bumpkin in his
best London clothes!"  

His appearance is suggested in a letter of February 18, 1900:

"The checked flannel trousers are perfect, with the seat coming about my knees, and the legs reaching only to the tops of my shoes. ... the dress coat is simply perfect, and I am learning how to manipulate the tails when I sit down."

The school paper appraised his performance:

Uncle Bopaddy is deaf, and Roosevelt imitated very cleverly a deaf man's voice. Like a good many deaf men, Bopaddy could hear when he wanted to. Roosevelt did very well indeed, and looked like an old print in his beginning-of-the-century costume.

Roosevelt was much interested in the Boer question during his last year at Groton. He had wanted to debate upon it in the Senior Debating Society but was to speak the second week and feared that the first group of debaters would select the question. He expressed his stand on the problem to his parents, declaring his
sympathy for the Boers but agreeing that from the humanitarian standpoint it would be best to have the British win speedily. On January 23, 1900, he made a two-minute speech when the Boer question was debated in the Senior Society. The following week Roosevelt was to support Philippine independence; he wrote on January 26:

"I am working all the time on my debate and hope to be able to say it off. well. It comes next Monday night and if I win it will mean four years debating without a single defeat."

However, he felt that the affirmative was "by far the poorest side of the question" and doubted that he and his two colleagues would win. He explained to his parents in his letter of February 1, 1900, that the loss came through no fault of his own, appraising the debate thus:

"The first speaker on my side, Hare, made rather a failure, as he didn’t know his debate at all. Sam Hinckley my other colleague had an excellent
speech but he rattled it off so fast that no one could understand him! On the other hand our opponents were all fair, and had the entire sympathy of the audience & made the American eagle crow so loud as he could, and Blubber Derby was so ludicrous that the whole room was convulsed at the funny way he spoke. However when the votes were counted they stood 21 to 19 against us, so you see we were not so very bad."

38 Ibid., pp. 382-383.

Other resolutions discussed at later meetings concerned the ship subsidy bill, the reelection of McKinley, and the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. It is a reasonable assumption that Roosevelt participated in the two-minute speeches given by members not on the teams on these questions.

The restriction on notes had resulted in improvement in the prepared debate speeches, in the opinion of a writer in The Grotonian, but he referred to the strong feeling among the boys against making the two-minute speeches. His analysis, to some extent indicative of the philosophy held at Groton in 1900, continued thus:

"These speeches, though apparently unimportant develop one's ability as a debater, at least as much as the one long prepared speech of the
year. The primary idea of debating is not so much to obtain finish and oratory in a speech, written and learned by heart, as to be at ease when on one's feet addressing a number of people, and to be able to state one's argument clearly and smoothly. This ease can be obtained only by frequent practice; the only way to get this practice is to take advantage of the opportunities the two-minute speeches present, by listening carefully to the principal speakers, detecting and exposing flaws in their arguments, explaining obscure points, or mentioning some argument which they have omitted.

Lathrop Brown pointed out that "the rules of rhetoric of the late Adams Sherman Hill were...a part of their being."

Lathrop Brown pointed out, "Groton education in English in those days was not founded so much on Latin and Greek
classics as on the works in English which have become classics." Op. cit. However, the Groton boys worked on the translation of both Greek and Latin. Roosevelt won the Latin prize in his final year at Groton (Early Years, p. 413); his work in Greek was excellent enough to allow him to include it among the hours of credit in which he "go up" to Harvard under Dr. Eliot's anticipation plan." Ibid., p. 328.

In March The Grotonian writer was detailing a plan to stimulate better attention, deportment, and participation in the two-minute speeches: (1) division of the four upper forms into two debating clubs, each to have a Junior and a Senior Society; (2) selection of the club's team for an evening to be made by the club's chairman of that division so that the members would feel responsibility for their club's success; (3) use of impartial judges rather than the audience. A statement of the purpose of debate occurs in connection with the objection that members would feel disloyal if their two-minute speeches did not favor their own club. The writer in The Grotonian declared:

The debating societies are organized for the purpose of teaching the members to speak, and for no other purpose. The subject, although a valuable training for the mind and reasoning faculties, is a secondary matter, for debating is not a means for communicating thought, but merely an opportunity to learn to be able to communicate thought. So the harm arising from some of the members of the club speaking in favor of a cause which they believe to be wrong
bears no weight when balanced against the advantages obtained from the increased interest in debating.\(^2\)


Whether the masters concurred in this emphasis on club loyalty at the expense of true belief is not known. That this exercise in debating resulted in some skill in the use of sources and in the communication of ideas to an audience cannot be denied.\(^3\)

\(^3\) Dr. E. B. Krumbhaar, although he pointed out that the boys at Groton felt debating to be "a valuable experience," said of its influence upon F.D. Roosevelt: "I doubt if Groton debating had much to do with his later ability in public speaking." *Op. cit.*

**Experiences in listening at Groton**

Every boy at Groton was also influenced by hearing a great deal of good literature read aloud\(^4\) and by

\(^4\) Roosevelt's mother had begun reading to him in his earliest years; she read while he lay on the floor pasting stamps or when they went sailing together. "His mother's diaries refer to his reading or their reading together such books as Maclay's *History of our Navy*, or Admiral Mahan's *Influence of Sea Power*, or his *Life of Nelson*." Rita H. Kleeman, *Gracious Lady*, D. Appleton-Century, New York, 1935, pp. 188, 190.
attending lectures by prominent men. The "protrait" of Endicott Peabody, founder and long the Headmaster of Groton School, sponsored by T.R. Coward and several of the school's trustees and written by a Groton graduate, points out that after the evening study period

"the boys would go to the master's study, where he would read to them before putting them to bed or where all would sit around and talk, read, or listen to a phonograph."45


There were also many special occasions, as on December 13 of Roosevelt's first year, when the Rector's father came to the school and read Dickens' Christmas Carol;46 again,

46The Grotonian, XIII: 45, December, 1896.

in Roosevelt's first spring at Groton, Mrs. Sidney Lanier came to the school to read the poems and letters of her husband, the poet.47 That the splendid phrases and


rhythms of the Episcopal service fell upon the boys' ears at the morning chapel service each weekday and at the two Sunday services is a fact of importance.48

During Roosevelt's first year of attendance at boarding-school, Governor George S. Boutwell, of Groton, came on November 30 to address the two debating societies on the art of "Public Speaking." The student paper reported:

"Governor Boutwell spoke for about an hour, yet he held the attention of everyone with extraordinary ability, and intensely interested his audience throughout.

"A public speaker, beyond having those natural qualities of a good voice and imposing manner, should be original, and not try to copy anyone else. His knowledge with reference to his subject should be thorough, and he should have fluency so as not to irritate his hearers.

"These essential qualities are difficult to acquire, but by listening early in life to good speakers and reading the best of literature, the Bible and Shakespeare for examples, the most satisfactory results are obtained.

"The debater should be an eloquent speaker, and should possess unlimited information about his point. Still more, he should be a man with great memory and courage, and ought to show no signs of hesitation or doubt to his adversary, for there is nothing so fatal to his success as this."49


As a new member of the Junior Debating Society in 1896, Roosevelt must have heard these words of Governor Boutwell. That he did not attempt to follow the style of other speakers was firmly stated by Mrs. F.D. Roosevelt,
who pointed to his study of American and English literature as bases of his rhetorical development and added the fact that he read the Bible through in its entirety once every two terms at Groton.\footnote{Interview with Mrs. F.D. Roosevelt, Hyde Park, New York, August 17, 1947.}

In June, 1897, Governor Wolcott of Massachusetts spoke on the need for public spirit, claiming that "there is no reward equal to the pleasure of serving the nation."\footnote{The Grotonian, XIII: 160, June, 1897.}

At the Prize Day exercises the following year, at which Franklin Roosevelt was one of the students to receive the punctuality prize, Mr. Peabody introduced Mr. Canfield, President of the University of Ohio, who declared that a man should have

"three legitimate ambitions, first, to live in the world, as opposed to merely existing, second, to make his life count, and, third, to leave behind him something for which his name would be respected."\footnote{Ibid., XIV: 171-172, June, 1898.}

Perhaps more interesting to Franklin Roosevelt were the visits of Theodore Roosevelt to Groton. The
esteem in which Mr. Roosevelt was held at the school was demonstrated by the fact that Dr. Peabody asked him to come as a member of the original faculty in 1884; Mr. Roosevelt was a New York assemblyman and a free-lance historian at that time. On June 4, 1897, Mr. Roosevelt outlined to the school the principles which should govern every American; he declared that failures may lead to final success and that a true American treats all other men as equals and brothers. Three years later Roosevelt, now governor of New York, spoke to the school again, declaring that if a man has courage, goodness, and brains he can accomplish great work, and is the man needed in politics. Such addresses as these not only demonstrated to the boys effective techniques of speaking but must have interested them in ideals of life and service.

Groton sent its graduates to Harvard or Yale. To Harvard went Franklin Roosevelt to rise to Editor of its
famous Crimson, leader of the Political Club, a "busy young man" who talked to a great many people a day "from the President of the University down," and a personal friend of "Copey." Groton influences were overlaid and

Mrs. F.D. Roosevelt spoke of the enthusiasm with which this great reader was heard. Interview, August 17, 1947. His friend and Cambridge associate, Rollo W. Brown, described his influence: "Especially Copey was in earnest. He enjoyed participating in the mighty enterprise of awakening young men... His reading was so vivid, so complete an expression of the author read, that nobody could forget it. Men listened to him and wondered how they had in their own reading been so incompletely present.... In consequence, men went about in the Yard—and after—with their heads ringing with Dr. Johnson, and Blake, and Wordsworth, and Scott, and Lamb, and George Borrow, and Tennyson, and Dickens, and Hardy, and Stevenson, and Conrad, and Francis Thompson, and Kipling, and Walter de la Mare, and Masefield, and Abraham Lincoln, and Thoreau, and Whitman, and Mark Twain, and many and many another." The Atlantic Monthly, 179: 76, January, 1947, "Copey."

At Harvard, Roosevelt belonged to the Groton Club and, in 1901, wrote his parents of "the glorious success" of its annual dinner. Early Years, p. 448. Perhaps the strongest Groton influence was the personal power of its Headmaster, Endicott Peabody, who remembered his former pupils with birthday greetings and letters of advice as long as he lived. "It was his true essence which he communicated to the boys. They learned determination, to know cricket from non-cricket, to be unafraid." Harper's, 188: 159, January, 1944, "Preface to a Schoolmaster's Biography," George W. Martin.
Two letters from Franklin Roosevelt to the Headmaster are significant. On February 10, 1936, the President wrote, "If you had not sent me a birthday card I should have been really worried. Do you know that I have every one of them that you sent me since the earliest days after I graduated?" Ashburn, op. cit., p. 347. From Warm Springs, Georgia, Roosevelt wrote on April 25, 1940, "More than forty years ago you said, in a sermon in the old Chapel, something about not losing boyhood ideals in later life. Those were Groton ideals--taught by you--I try not to forget--and your words are still with me and with hundreds of others of 'us boys'." Ibid.
Speech No. 1

Acceptance Address, Franklin Field, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, June 27, 1936

Senator Robinson, Members of the Democratic Convention, my friends here and in every community throughout the land:

We are met at a time of great moment to the future of the Nation, an occasion to be dedicated to the simple and sincere expression of an attitude toward problems, the determination of which will profoundly affect America.

I come not only as a leader of a party—not only as a candidate for high office, but as one upon whom many critical hours have imposed and still impose a grave responsibility.

For the sympathy, for the help and confidence with which Americans have sustained me in my task I am grateful. For their loyalty I salute the members of our great party, in and out of political life in every part of the Union. And I salute, too, those of other parties, especially those in the Congress of the United States who on so many occasions have put partisanship aside. I thank the Governors of the several States, their legislatures, their state and local officials who participated unselfishly and regardless of party in our efforts to achieve recovery and destroy abuse.
Above all, I thank the millions of Americans who have borne disaster bravely and have dared to smile through the storm.

And America will not forget these recent years--will not forget that the rescue was not a mere party task--it was the concern of all of us. In our strength we rose together, rallied our energies together, applied the old rules of common sense, and together survived.

It was in those days, my friends, that we feared fear. That was why we fought fear. And today, my friends, we have won against the most dangerous of our foes--we have conquered fear.

But I cannot, I cannot with candor, tell you that all is well with the world. Clouds of suspicion, tides of ill will and intolerance gather darkly in many places. In our own land we enjoy indeed a fullness of life that is greater than that of most nations. But the rush of modern civilization itself has raised for us new difficulties, new problems which must be solved if we are to preserve to the United States the political and the economic freedom for which Washington and Jefferson planned and fought.

Philadelphia, Philadelphia, is a good city in which to write American history. This is, this is fitting
ground on which to reaffirm the faith of the fathers—to pledge ourselves to restore to the people a wider freedom—to give to nineteen thirty-six as the founders gave to seventeen seventy-six—an American way of life.

That very word freedom, in itself and of necessity, suggests freedom from some restraining power. In seventeen seventy-six we sought freedom from the tyranny of a political autocracy—from the eighteenth century royalists who held special privileges from the crown. It was to perpetuate their privilege that they governed without the consent of the governed; that they denied the right of free assembly and free speech; that they restricted the worship of God; that they put the average man's property and the average man's life in pawn to the mercenaries of dynastic power—that they regimented the people.

And so—so it was to win freedom from the tyranny of political autocracy that the American Revolution was fought. That victory gave the business of governing into the hands of the average man, who won the right with his neighbors to make and order his own destiny through his own government. Political tyranny was wiped out at Philadelphia on July fourth, seventeen seventy-six.

But, since that struggle, man's inventive genius released new forces in our land, forces which reordered the
lives of our people. The age of machinery, of railroads, of steam and electricity; the telegraph and the radio; mass production, mass distribution—all of these combined to bring forward a new civilization and with it a problem for those who sought to remain free.

For out of this modern civilization economic royalists carved new dynasties. New kingdoms were built upon concentration of control over material things. Through new uses of corporations, and banks and securities, new machinery of industry and agriculture, of labor and capital—all undreamed of by the fathers—the whole structure of modern life was impressed into this royal service.

There was no place among this royalty for our many thousands of small business men and merchants who sought to make a worthy use of the American system of initiative and profit. They were no more free than the worker or the farmer. Even honest and progressive-minded men of wealth, aware of their obligation to their generation, could never know just where they fitted in to—into this dynastic scheme of things.

And so, it was natural and perfectly human that the privileged princes of these new economic dynasties, thirsting for power, reached out for control over
Government itself. They created a new despotism and wrapped it—wrapped it in the robes of legal sanction. In its service new mercenaries sought to regiment the people, their labor, their property. And as a result the average man once more confronts the problem that faced the Minute Man of seventy-six.

The hours—the hours that men and women worked, the wages they received, the conditions of their labor—these had passed beyond the control of the people, and were imposed by this new industrial dictatorship. The savings of the average family, the capital of the small business man, the investments set aside for old age—other people's money—these were the tools which the new economic royalty used to dig itself in.

Those who tilled the soil no longer reaped the rewards which were their right. The small measure of their gains were decreed by men in distant cities.

Throughout the Nation, opportunity was limited by monopoly. Individual initiative was crushed in the cogs of a great machine. The field open for free enterprise was more and more restricted. Private enterprise, indeed, became too private. It became privileged enterprise, not free enterprise.

An old English judge said once upon a time:
"Necessitous men are not free men." Liberty requires opportunity to make a living—a living decent according to the standard of the time, a living which gives man not only enough to live by, but something to live for.

For too many of us the political equality we once had won was meaningless in the face of economic inequality. A small group had concentrated into their own hands an almost complete control over other people's property, other people's money, other people's labor—other people's lives. For too many of us, for too many of us throughout the land, life was no longer free; liberty no longer real; men could no longer follow the pursuit of happiness.

Against economic tyranny such as this, the American citizen could only appeal to the organized power of government. We will remember that the collapse of nineteen twenty-nine showed up the despotism for what it was. And the election of nineteen thirty-two was the people's mandate to end it, and under that mandate it is being ended.

The royalists I have spoken of—the royalists of the economic order have conceded that political freedom was the business of the Government, but they have maintained that economic slavery was nobody's business. They
granted that the government could protect the citizen in his right to vote, but they denied that the government could do anything to protect the citizen in his right to work and his right to live.

Today, today we stand committed to the proposition that freedom is no half and half affair. If the average citizen is guaranteed equal opportunity in the polling place, he must have equal opportunity in the market place.

These economic royalists complain that we seek to overthrow the institutions of America. What they really complain of is that we seek to take away their power. Our allegiance—and our allegiance to American institutions requires the overthrow of this kind of power. In vain they seek to hide behind the Flag and the Constitution. But in their blindness they forget what the Flag and the Constitution stand for. Now, now as always, for over a century and a half, the Flag, the Constitution, stand against a dictatorship by mob rule and the overprivileged alike, and the Flag and the Constitution stand for democracy, not tyranny; for freedom, not subjection.

The brave platform, the clear platform adopted by this Convention, that platform to which I heartily subscribe, sets forth that government in a modern civilization has certain inescapable obligations to its citizens, among
which are protection of the family and the home, the establishment of a democracy of opportunity, and aid to those overtaken by disaster.

But the resolute enemy within our gates is ever ready to beat down our words unless in greater courage we will fight for them.

More than three years, for more than three years we have fought for them. This convention, this convention in every word and in every deed has pledged that that fight will go on.

The defeats and the victories of these years have given to us as a people a new understanding of our government—yes, and a new understanding of ourselves. Never since the early days of the New England town meeting have the affairs of Government been so widely discussed and so clearly appreciated. It has been brought home to us that the only effective guide for the safety of this most worldly of worlds, the greatest guide of all, is moral principle.

We do not see—we do not see faith, and hope, and charity as unattainable ideals; we use them as stout supports of a Nation fighting the fight for freedom in a modern civilization.

Faith—faith in the soundness of democracy in the midst of dictatorships.
Hope—hope renewed because we know so well the progress we have made.

And charity—charity in the true spirit of that grand old word. For charity literally translated from the original means love, the love that understands, that does not merely share the wealth of the giver, but in true sympathy and wisdom helps men to help themselves.

We seek not merely to make government a mechanical implement, but to give it the vibrant personal character that is the very embodiment of human charity.

We are poor indeed if this Nation cannot afford to lift from every recess of American life the dread fear of the unemployed that they are not needed in the world. We cannot afford—we cannot afford to accumulate a deficit in the books of human fortitude.

And so, in the place of the palace of privilege, we seek to build a temple out of faith and hope and charity.

It is a sobering thing, my friends, to be a servant of this great cause. We try in our daily work to remember that the cause belongs not to us, but to the people. The standard is not in the hands of you and me alone. It is carried by America. We seek—all of us, I hope—we seek daily to profit from experience, to learn to do better as our task proceeds.
Governments can err--Presidents do make mistakes, but the immortal Dante tells us that divine justice weighs the sins of the cold-blooded and the sins of the warm-hearted in different scales.

Better the occasional faults of a government that lives in a spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much is given. Of other generations much is expected. This generations of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny.

In this world of ours, in other lands, there are some people who, in times past, have lived and fought for freedom, and seem to have grown too weary to carry on the fight. They have sold their heritage of freedom for the illusion of a living. They have yielded their democracy.

I believe in my heart that only our success can stir their ancient hope. They begin to know that here, here in America, we are waging a great and successful war. It is not alone a war against want and destitution and economic demoralization. It is more than that; it is a war for the survival of democracy. We are fighting, fighting to save a great and precious form of government
for ourselves and for the world.

And so I accept the commission you have tendered me. I join with you. I am enlisted for the duration of the war.
Governor Lehman--Governor Lehman, Mayor Thatcher, Ladies and Gentlemen:

From force of long habit I had almost said, "My fellow delegates."

Tonight you and I join forces for the nineteen thirty-six campaign. We are entering it with confidence. Never was there greater need for fidelity to the underlying conception of Americanism than there is today. And once again--once again--it is given to our Party to carry the message of that Americanism to the people.

The task--the task--on our part is twofold: First, as simple patriotism requires, to separate the false from the real issues; and, secondly, with facts and without rancor, to clarify the real problems for the American public.

I need not tell you that there will be--there are--many false issues. In that respect, this will be no different from other campaigns. Partisans, not willing to face realities, will drag out red herrings--as they have
always done—to divert attention from the trail of their own weaknesses.

And this practice is as old as our democracy. Avoiding the facts—fearful of the truth—a malicious opposition charged that George Washington planned to make himself king under a British form of government; that Thomas Jefferson planned to set up a guillotine in every square under the French Revolutionary form of government; that Andrew Jackson soaked the rich—soaked the rich—of the Eastern seaboard and planned to surrender American democracy to the dictatorship of a frontier mob. They called Abraham Lincoln a Roman Emperor; Theodore Roosevelt a Destroyer; Woodrow Wilson a self-constituted Messiah.

And in this campaign another herring turns up. In former years it has been British or French—and a variety of other things. But this year it's Russian. Desperate in mood, angry at failure, cunning in purpose, individuals and groups are seeking to make communism an issue in an election where communism is not a controversy between the two major parties.

Here are now, once and for all, let us bury that red herring, and destroy that false issue. You are familiar with my background; you know my heritage; and you are familiar, especially in the State of New York, with my
public service extending back over a quarter of a century. For nearly four years I have been President of the United States. A long record has been written. In that record, both in this State and in the National Capital, you will find a simple, clear and consistent adherence not only to the letter but to the spirit of the American form of government.

To that record, my future and the future of my administration will conform. I have not sought, I do not seek, I repudiate the support of any advocate of communism or of any other alien—and that goes for any other alien "ism" which would by fair means or foul change our American democracy.

That is my position. It always has been my position. And it always will be my position.

There is no difference between the two major parties as to what they think about communism.

But there is a great difference between the parties in what they do about communism.

And I will tell you why: Communism is a manifestation of the social unrest which always comes with widespread economic maladjustment. We in the Democratic party have not been content merely to denounce this menace. We have been realistic enough to face it. We have been
intelligent enough to do something about it. And the world has seen the results of what we've done.

In the spring, three years and a half ago, in the spring of nineteen thirty-three, we faced a crisis which was the ugly fruit of twelve years of neglect— neglect of the causes of economic and social unrest. It was a crisis made to order for all those who would overthrow our form of government. Do I need to recall to you the fear of those days—reports of those who piled supplies in their basements, who laid plans to get their fortunes across the border, who got themselves hideaways in the country against the impending upheaval? Do I need to recall the law-abiding heads of peaceful families, who began to wonder, as they saw their children starve, how they would get the bread they saw in the bakery window? Do I need to recall the homeless boys who were traveling in bands through the countryside seeking work, seeking food—desperate because they could find neither? Do I need to recall the farmers who banded together with pitchforks to keep the sheriff from selling the farm home under foreclosure? Do I need to recall the powerful leaders of industry and banking who came to me in Washington in those early days of nineteen thirty-three pleading to be saved?

Most people in the United States remember today
the fact that starvation was averted, that homes and farms were saved, that banks were reopened, that crop prices rose, that industry revived, and that the dangerous forces of subversion of our form of government were turned aside.

A few—a few only—unwilling to remember, seem to have forgotten those days.

In the summer of nineteen thirty-three, a nice old gentleman wearing a silk hat, fell off the end of a pier. He was unable to swim. A friend ran down the pier, dived overboard and pulled him out, but the silk hat floated off with the tide. After the old gentleman had been revived, he was effusive in his thanks. He praised his friend for saving his life. Today, three years later, the old gentleman is berating his friend because his silk hat was lost.

Why did that crisis from nineteen twenty-nine to nineteen thirty-three pass without disaster?

The answer is found in the record of what we did. Early in the campaign of nineteen thirty-two I said: "To meet by reaction that danger of radicalism is to invite disaster. The way to meet that danger is to offer a workable program of reconstruction, and the party to offer it is the party with clean hands." We met the emergency—we met the emergency with emergency action. But far more
important than that, we went to the roots of the problem, and attacked the cause of the crisis. We were against revolution. And, therefore, we waged war against those conditions which make revolutions—against the inequalities and the resentments that breed them. In America in nineteen thirty-three the people did not attempt to remedy wrongs by overthrowing institutions. Americans were made to realize that wrongs could and would be set right within their institutions. We proved that democracy CAN work.

I have said to you that there is a very great difference between the two parties in what they do about communism. Conditions congenial to communism were being bred and fostered throughout this Nation up to the very day of March fourth, nineteen thirty-three. Hunger was breeding it, loss of homes and farms were breeding it, closing banks were breeding it, a ruinous price level was breeding it. Discontent and fear were spreading throughout the land. And the previous national Administration, bewildered, did nothing.

In their speeches—in their speeches they deplored it, but by their actions they encouraged it. The injustices, the inequalities, the downright suffering out of which revolutions come—what did they do about these things? Lacking courage, they evaded. Being selfish, they neglected.
Being short-sighted, they ignored. And when the crisis came—as these wrongs made it sure to come—America was unprepared.

The lack of preparation for it was best proved by the cringing and the fear of the very people whose indifference helped to make the crisis. They came to us pleading that we should do, overnight, what they should have been doing through the years.

And the simple causes of our unpreparedness were two: First, a weak leadership, and, secondly, an inability to see the causes, to understand the reasons for social unrest—the tragic plight of ninety percent of the men, women and children who made up the population of the United States.

It has been well said that "Every empire that has crashed has come down primarily because its rulers didn't know what was going on in the world and were incapable of learning."

It is for that reason, my friends, that our American form of government will continue to be safest in Democratic hands. The real, actual, undercover Republican leadership is the same as it was four years ago. That leadership will never comprehend the need for a program of
social justice and of regard for the well-being of the masses of our people.

I have been comparing leadership in Washington, This contrast between Democratic and Republican leadership holds true throughout the length and breadth of the State of New York. As far back as the year nineteen ten, the old Black Horse Cavalry, which we old people can remember—the old Black Horse Cavalry in Albany—was failing to meet changing social conditions by appropriate social legislation. Here was a State noted for its industry, noted for its agriculture—a State with the greatest mixture of population—where the poorest and the richest lived, literally, within a stone's throw of each other—in short, a situation made to order for potential unrest. And yet in this situation the best that the Republican leaders of those days could say was: "Let them eat cake." What would have happened if that reactionary domination had continued through all these hard years?

Starting in nineteen hundred and eleven, a Democratic leadership came into power, and with it a new philosophy of government. I had the good fortune to come into public office at that time. I found other young men in the Legislature—men who held the same philosophy—and one of them was Bob Wagner, and another was Al Smith. We
were all joined in a common cause. We did not look on
government as something apart from the people. We thought
of it as something to be used by the people for their own
good.

New factory legislation setting up decent
standards of safety and sanitation; limitation of the hours
of women in industry—mind you, to fifty four hours a week--
a workmen's compensation law; a one day rest in seven law;
a full train crew law; a direct primary law--these laws and
many more that were passed; then they were called radical
and alien to our form of government. Would you or any other
Americans call them radical or alien today?

In later years, first under Governor Smith, and
then during my Governorship, this program of practical
intelligence was carried forward over the typical--every
year, in and out--unswerving opposition of Republican
leaders throughout our State.

And today the great tradition of a liberal,
progressive Democratic Party has been carried still further
by our present great Governor, Herbert H. Lehman. He has
begun a program of social insurance to remove the spectre
of unemployment from the working people of the State. He
has broadened our labor legislation. He has extended the
supervision of public utility companies. He has proved
himself an untiring seeker for the public good; a doer of
social justice; a wise, conscientious, clear-headed and
business-like administrator of the executive branch of our
Government. And be it noted that his opponents are led and
backed by the same forces and, in many cases, by the same
individuals who, for a quarter of a century, have tried to
hamstring progress in this State. The overwhelming
majority of our citizens, up-State and down-State, regardless
of party, propose to return him and his Administration to
Albany for another two years.

His task in Albany, like my task in Washington,
has been to maintain contact between statecraft and reality.
In New York and in Washington, Government which has rendered
more than lip service to our constitutional democracy has
done a work for the protection and preservation of our
institutions that could not have been accomplished by
repression and force.

Let me warn you and let me warn the Nation
against the smooth evasion that says: "Of course we believe
these things; we believe in social security; we believe in
work for the unemployed; we believe in saving homes. Cross
our hearts and hope to die, we believe in all these things;
but we do not like the way the present administration is
doing them. Just turn them over to us. We will do all of
them—we will do more of them—we will do them better; and, most important of all, the doing of them will not cost anybody anything."

But, my friends, these evaders are banking too heavily on the shortness of our memories. No one will forget that they had their golden opportunity—twelve long years of it.

And remember, too, that the first essential of doing a job well is to want to see the job done. Make no mistake, though, about this: the Republican leadership today is not against the way we have done the job. The Republican leadership is against the job being done.

Look to the source of the promises of the past. Governor Lehman knows and I know how little legislation in the interests of the average citizen would be on the statute books of the State of New York, and of the Federal Government, if we had waited for Republican leaders to pass it.

The same lack of purpose of fulfillment lies behind the promises of today. You cannot be an Old Guard Republican in the East and a New Deal Republican in the West. You cannot promise to repeal taxes before one audience and promise to spend more of the taxpayer's money before another audience. You cannot promise tax relief for those who can afford to pay, and, at the same time, promise
more of the taxpayers' money for those who are in need. You simply cannot make good on both promises at the same time.

Who is there in America who believes that we can run the risk of turning back our Government to the old leadership which brought it to the brink of nineteen thirty-three? Out of the strains and the stresses of these years we now come to see that the true conservative is the man who has a real concern for the injustices and takes thought against the day of reckoning. The true conservative seeks to protect the system of private property and free enterprise by correcting such injustices and inequalities as arise from it. The most serious threat to our institutions comes from those who refuse to face the need for change. Liberalism—liberalism becomes the protection for the far-sighted conservative.

Never has a Nation made greater strides in the safeguarding of democracy than we have made during the past three years. Wise and prudent men—intelligent conservatives—have long known that in a changing world worthy institutions can only be conserved by adjusting them to the changing time. In the words of the great essayist—"The voice of great events is proclaiming to us—Reform if you would conserve."
I am that kind of a conservative because I am that kind of a liberal.
Speech No. 3

Address at Forbes Field, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, October 1, 1936

Mr. Chairman, Governor Earle, my friends of Pennsylvania:

A baseball park is a good place to talk about box scores. And tonight I am going to talk to you about the box score of the government of the United States. I am going to tell you the story of our fight to beat down the depression and win recovery. And where I stand—and from where I stand it looks as if the game is pretty well in the bag.

I am convinced that when government finance or any other kind of finance is honest—and when all the cards are on the table—there is no higher mathematics about it. It's just plain, score-board arithmetic.

Now, when—when the present management of your team took charge in nineteen thirty-three, the national scoreboard looked pretty bad. In fact, it looked so much like a shut-out for the team that you voted a change in management in order to give—in order to give the country a chance to win the game. And today we are winning it.

When the new management came to Washington, we began to make our plans—plans to meet the immediate
crisis—and plans that would carry the people of the country back to decent prosperity.

You and I and everybody else saw millions out of work, saw the business concerns running in the red, saw the banks closing. Our national income had declined over fifty percent—and, what was worse, it showed no prospect of recuperating by itself. By national income I mean the total of all the incomes of all the one hundred twenty-five million people in this country—the total of all the pay envelopes, all the farm sales, all the profits of all the businesses, and all the individuals and all the corporations in America.

During the four lean years before this Administration took office, that national income that I am talking about had declined from eighty-one billion dollars a year to thirty-eight billion dollars a year. In short, you and I—all of us together—were making forty-one billion—spelled with a "b" not an "m"—less dollars in nineteen thirty-two than we had made in nineteen twenty-nine.

Now, the rise and fall in national income—since they tell the story of how much you and I and everybody else are making—are an index of the rise and fall of national prosperity. It is also an index of the prosperity of your government. The money to run the government comes from
taxes; and the tax revenue in turn depends for its size on the size of the national income. Thus, when the incomes and the values and the transactions of the country are on the down-grade, then the tax receipts of the government go on the down-grade too. And if the national income continues to decline, then the government cannot run without going into the red. The only way to keep the government out of the red is to keep the people out of the red. And so—and so we had to balance the budget of the American people before we could balance the budget of the national government. That—that makes common sense, doesn't it?

Well, when the box score, the box score when the Democratic Administration came in in nineteen thirty-three showed a net deficit in our national accounts of about three billion dollars, accumulated in the three previous years under my predecessor.

National income—national income was on a downward spiral, and Federal Government revenues were in a downward spiral. To pile vast new taxes would get us nowhere because values were going down, and that makes sense too.

And so on top of having to meet the ordinary expenses of the government, I recognized the obligation of the Federal Government to feed and take care of the growing army of homeless and destitute unemployed.
Something had to be done, we all know that. A national choice had to be made. We could do one of two things. Some people urged me to let Nature take its course; some people urged me to continue a policy of doing nothing. I rejected that advice because Nature was in an angry mood.

To have accepted that advice would have meant a continued wiping out of people of small means—the continued loss of their homes and farms and small businesses into the hands of people who still had enough capital left to pick up those homes and farms and businesses at bankruptcy prices. It would have meant—it would have meant, in a very short time, the loss of all the resources of a multitude of individuals and families and small corporations. You would have seen, throughout the Nation, a concentration of property ownership in the hands of one or two percent of the population, a concentration unequalled in any great nation since the days of the Roman Empire.

And so the program of this Administration set out to protect the small business, the small corporation, the small shop and the small individual from the wave of deflation that threatened them. We realized then, as we do now, that the vast army of small business men, and factory owners and shop owners, form the background—the
backbone, together with our farmers and workers, the backbone of America. And in our long range plan we recognized that the prosperity of America depended upon, and would continue to depend upon, the prosperity of all of them.

I rejected the advice that was given to me to do nothing for an additional reason. I had promised, and my Administration was determined, to keep the people of the United States from starvation.

Yes, and I refused to leave human needs solely in the hands of local communities, local communities which themselves were almost bankrupt.

To have accepted that advice would have been to offer breadlines again to the American people, knowing this time, however, that in many places the lines would last far longer than the bread! And in those dark days, between us and a balanced budget, stood millions of needy Americans, denied the promise of a decent American life.

To balance our budget in nineteen thirty-three or thirty-four or thirty-five would have been a crime against the American people. To do so we would either have had to make a capital levy that would have been confiscatory, or we would have had to set our face against human suffering with callous indifference. When Americans suffered, we
refused to pass by on the other side. Humanity came first.

Now, my friends, nobody with any sense of responsibility lightly lays a burden on the income of a Nation. But this vicious tightening circle of our declining national income had to be broken. The bankers and the industrialists of the Nation cried aloud that private business was powerless to break it. They turned, as they had a right to turn, to the government itself. And we accepted the final responsibility of government, after all else had failed, responsibility to spend money when no one else had money left to spend.

I adopted, therefore, the other alternative. I cast aside the do-nothing or wait-and-see policy.

As a first step in our program we had to stop the quick spiral of deflation, the spiral and the decline in the national income. And, having stopped them, we went on to restore purchasing power, to raise values, to put people back to work, and to start the national income going up again.

Yes, in nineteen thirty-three we reversed the policy of the previous administration. For the first time since the depression you had a Congress and an Administration in Washington that had the courage to provide the necessary resources which private interests no longer had
or no longer dared to risk.

This cost money. We knew and you knew in March, nineteen thirty-three, that it would cost money. We knew and you knew that it would cost money for several years to come.

The people understood that in nineteen thirty-three. They understood it in nineteen thirty-four when they gave the administration a full endorsement of its policy. They knew it in nineteen thirty-five, and they know in nineteen thirty-six that the plan is working.

All right, my friends, let's look at the cost. Since we could not get the money by taxes—and ought not to have got it by taxes in those years—we borrowed it, and we increased the public debt.

President Hoover's administration increased the debt—increased the debt in the net amount of over three billion dollars in three depression years, and there was little to show for it. My administration has increased the national debt in the net amount of eight billion dollars and there is much to show for it.

Now, let's take that figure of eight billion out here on the scoreboard and let me tell you where the dollars went.

Over a billion and a half went for payment of the
World War Veterans' Bonus this year instead of nineteen forty-five. That payment is now out of the way, and is no longer a future obligation of the government.

As for the other six and a half billion, we didn't just spend money—we spent money for something. America got something for what it spent—the conservation of human resources through C.C.C. camps, through work relief; conservation of natural resources of water, soil and forest; billions for security and a better life. And remember that while many who criticize today were selling America short, we were investing in the future of America.

Contrast those expenditures and what we got for them with certain other expenditures of the American people in the years between nineteen twenty and nineteen thirty. During that period not merely eight billions but many more billions—about fourteen billions—came out of American pockets and were sent abroad, to foreign countries where the money was used for increasing foreign armaments, for building foreign factories to compete with us, for building foreign dwellings, swimming pools, slaughter houses, for giving employment to the foreign unemployed—foreign boondoggling, if you like it.

Now those dollars—fourteen billion of them—were just as good American money—just as hard-earned—just as
much the reward of thrift—as the dollars that we've spent these past three years at home giving work to the unemployed. But most of those dollars that went abroad, why—they're gone for good. Those billions, lost to us under previous Administrations, do not, by the way, include the other billions loaned by the United States, to foreign governments during and immediately after the War.

And so I ask you the simple question: Hasn't it been a sounder investment for us during these past three years to spend eight billion dollars for American industry, American farms, American homes and the care of American citizens?

Now, my friends, I've used that figure of eight billion dollars as representing the net increase in our national debt, and immediately people will rush into print or run to the microphone to tell you that my arithmetic is all wrong. They will tell you that the increase in the national debt is thirteen billions instead of eight. Now, that is technically and morally just as correct as if someone were to try to scare you about the condition of your bank by telling you all about its liabilities and not telling you about its assets.

And that is technically and morally just as correct as telling you good people in Pennsylvania that none of your
bank deposits or insurance policies are any good.

When you are told--when you are told that the United States Treasury has thirteen billions more of liabilities than it had in nineteen thirty-three, you should also be told that it has six billion dollars of increased assets to set off against these liabilities.

Yes, in three years our net national debt has increased eight billions of dollars. But in two years of the recent war it increased as much as twenty-five billion dollars. National defense--national defense and the future of America were involved in nineteen seventeen and eighteen. National defense and the future of America were also involved in nineteen thirty-three. Don't you believe that the saving of America has been cheap at that price?

And, incidentally, my friends, tonight is an anniversary, an anniversary in the affairs of your government that I want to celebrate with you and the American people. It is October first, and it marks the end of a whole year in which there has not been a single national bank failure in all the United States. But wait--wait--it has been fifty-five years--not twelve long years, but fifty-five years--since that kind of a record has been established. You and I, you and I can take this occasion to rejoice in that record. It is proof that the program
has worked.

Compare the scoreboard that you have in Pittsburgh now with the scoreboard that you had when I stood here at second base in this field four years ago. At that time, as I drove through these great valleys, I could see mile after mile of mill—the greatest mill and factory area in the world, a dead panorama of silent black structures and smokeless stacks. I saw, I saw idleness and hunger instead of the whirl of machinery. And today as I came north from West Virginia, I saw mines operating, I found bustle and life, the hiss of steam, the ring of steel on steel—the roaring song of industry.

And now one word in closing about this foolish fear about the crushing load the debt will impose on your children and mine. This debt is not going to be paid by oppressive taxation on future generations. It's not going to be paid by taking away the hard-won savings of the present generation.

It is going to be paid out of an increased national income and increased individual incomes produced by increasing national prosperity.

The truth is—looking back over those—these—years—that we are doing better than we anticipated in nineteen thirty-three. The national income has gone up
faster than we dared then to hope. Deficits have been less than we expected. Treasury receipts are increasing. And, incidentally, the national debt today in relation to the national income is much less than it was in nineteen thirty-three, when this Administration took office.

One word more—they're simple figures; keep them in front of your heads—the national income in nineteen thirty-two was thirty-eight billions. In nineteen thirty-five it was fifty-three billion dollars, and this year--this year--it will be well over sixty billion dollars. And if it keeps on rising at the present rate, as I am confident it will, the receipts of the Government, without imposing any additional taxes, will, within a year or two, be sufficient to care for all ordinary and relief expenses of the Government, in other words, to balance the budget.

The Government, the Government of this great Nation, solvent, sound in credit, is coming through a crisis as grave as war--coming through without having sacrificed American democracy or the ideals of American life.
Speech No. 4

Address at Aksarben Coliseum,
Omaha, Nebraska, October 10, 1936

Mrs. Hitchcock, Governor Cochran, Mr. Mayor, you my friends of Nebraska and neighboring States:

I am glad to come back to Nebraska after an absence of only a few weeks; and I am especially glad to come for the first time to this marvelous Aksarben Hall and to receive your greetings.

First of all, a word to you as Nebraskans. I hope that this word will be heard by the citizens of the other forty-seven States because I know that what I am going to say represents the conviction of the great majority of those who are devoted to good government, clean government, representative government.

On this platform sits a man—a man whose reputation for many years has been known in every community—a man old in years but young in heart—a man who through all these years has had no boss but his own conscience—the Senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, given to the Nation by the people of Nebraska—George W. Norris.

Outside of my own State of New York, I have
consistently refrained from taking part in elections in any other State.

But Senator Norris' name has been entered as a candidate for Senator from Nebraska. And to my rule of non-participation in State elections I have made—and so long as he lives I always will make—one magnificently justified exception.

George Norris' candidacy transcends State and party lines. In our national history we have had few elder statesmen who like him have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years.

He is one of the major prophets of America.

My friends, help this great American to continue an historic career of service.

Nebraska will be doing a great service, not only to itself but to every other State in the Union and to the Nation as a whole, if it places this great American above partisanship, and keeps George Norris in the Senate of the United States.

I want to take you back four years, four years to nineteen thirty-two. In that year, when I was a candidate for the Presidency, I pledged my administration, if elected, to a farm policy that would help the farmer.
And tonight every man and woman on an American farm, East or West, who has read today's market report knows that we have done what we said we would do.

And what needed to be done?

You remember that in March, nineteen thirty-three, after twelve long years, farm income was disappearing and farm prices had sunk to a bankruptcy level.

In nineteen thirty-two America's farm population was the greatest in all our history, and yet the farmers' income was the lowest for the quarter of a century for which we have records. Farmers represented twenty-five percent of the Nation's population—but they got only seven and a half percent of the national income.

The spectre of foreclosure stalked the farmer's plow.

American agriculture was on the road to pauperism.

When the World War ended, the Nations of Europe whom we had been feeding went back to farming for themselves, and our farmers were left holding the bag—a bag that bulged with vast quantities of wheat, and corn, and cotton for which the market had collapsed.

That was the farmer's plight. And what did Republican leadership do about it?
The best that it could offer was a contraption called the Farm Board, a contraption that set an all-time high for extravagant futility. It met the problem of unsaleable and unexportable surpluses by piling up bigger surpluses.

And to finish the job, the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff robbed the farmer of his last chance for a foreign market.

We found that this conspicuous failure of Government to help the farmer had created—by March fourth, nineteen thirty-three—a state of mind in the Nation itself which seemed to bar any way out of the farmer's difficulties. There was a defeatist attitude—a conviction that the farmer could not be helped—that all efforts were foredoomed to failure—that any party that dared to substitute action for talk would get its political fingers burned.

And along with this defeatism there was the belief that money spent on the farm problem was money wasted—that the only excuse for spending it was to keep the farmer in line—in order to buy political peace.

Yes, that was what had happened to American agriculture when this administration came into office.

That was the debris of twelve years of failure
which we had to clear away before we could begin to lay the basis for a permanent agricultural prosperity.

Tonight you know that the ground has been cleared of that debris. After twelve years in which he had been harassed and weighed down by the burdens of each succeeding day, the farmer has at last begun to get into the clear, so that he can begin again to take thought for tomorrow.

Back of what we did was the conviction that the agricultural problem is not a problem for the farmer alone, but that it is a problem for the Nation as a whole. That is the way we attacked it.

And today the Nation is going along with the farmer. Now for the first time in this industrial period of our history, the American people understand that there's a definite bond between agriculture and industry—that the money that we have used for the restoration of American agriculture has been an investment, an investment in the restoration of American industry, an underwriting for the wages of American labor and a stimulus for profits in American business.

In other words, the defeatist attitude has itself been defeated.

And back of what we did was a second conviction—
that a sound farm policy must be a policy run by farmers. Ours is that kind of policy. The farmers of America moved into the Department of Agriculture on the day that Henry Wallace set up shop there. And for the very first time, a national farm program was made in conference and with agreement of the farm leaders of all of our farm organizations—a program—get this, a program which came out of the free and open councils of farmers themselves rather than out of the vote-catching schemes of politicians.

With these convictions, this administration put its hand to the plow. It has not turned, and it will not turn back.

I am going to tell you in just seven sentences what we did. Every man and woman in America, every man and woman on an American farm can expand these seven sentences in terms of the recovery that has come to each of them in the last three and a half years.

First, by our Agricultural Adjustment Act, our monetary policy, our soil conservation policy, and our assistance to farm cooperatives, we have raised the farmers' net annual income by three and half billion dollars to a sum three times what it was in nineteen thirty-two.
Second, through the Farm Credit Administration we have saved hundreds of thousands of homes and farms from foreclosure and reduced the staggering burden of the farmers' debts.

Third, through reciprocal trade agreements and international currency stabilization, we have begun to recover the farmers' foreign markets in the only way in which they can be recovered and held—by a policy of mutual advantage, mutual international advantage which today is bearing fruit in the reopening of markets for American farm products in all of the fourteen countries making these agreements—by a policy which, for example, within the last ten days has brought about lower tariffs in France, Italy and Switzerland for the benefit of our farmers. And, my friends, a growing trade is making for international peace.

Fourth, by our program to revive business—to increase employment—to raise business and professional incomes and the wages of labor—and by increasing the purchasing power and consumption of the average American family—we have restored national income, and prepared the way for the steady and long-time expansion of the farmers' home market.

Fifth, by our program of land use and
conservation we have ended the policy of immediate glut and eventual waste, and have laid the basis for a permanent plenty.

Sixth, by our program of rural electrification—and you people in Nebraska know what we're doing in this State—by our farm-to-market roads, by our farm-to-market roads, by our aid to rural schools, we have begun to get for the farmer his fair share in the comforts, the advantages, the wider interest and the deeper satisfactions which go to make the good life for himself and for his children.

And, seventh, when disastrous drought struck the land in many parts of our country, we rushed immediate and direct relief to the farmers and stockmen to save them from want—a policy that some people call waste but that you and I call wise.

There, my friends, is the record. In those seven sentences, the farmer and the farmer's family can measure for themselves the vast difference between the desperation that was theirs in the spring of nineteen thirty-three and the recovery which is theirs in nineteen thirty-six. From what that record has done and is doing for you, judge for yourselves our determination and our capacity to carry this program through.
After having neglected a twelve-year opportunity for help to the American farmer, as his condition got worse and worse, what does Republican leadership now offer?

First of all, it would scrap the present program, which it has condemned as a "subterfuge" and a "stop-gap". It would junk the farmers' organization to carry it out. It would end the farmers' program of cooperation, and send them back to the "free competition" and the "rugged individualism", if you will, that wrecked them in nineteen thirty-two.

And then, next, it would substitute a system of tariff, tariff-equivalent payments, I think they are called, not for any permanent contribution to farm wealth or national income, but merely as a cash hand-out, in other words, a dole. These payments, under their plan, would be made only to the producers of exportable farm crops, specifically on hogs, wheat, cotton and tobacco. But dairymen, cattlemen, sugar growers and producers of all the hundred other varieties of crops in which there is normally no exportable surplus would be left out.

What about—what about the effect of such a scheme? Would it serve to protect farmers from price collapse under a burden of surpluses? Would it guard them in the future against a disaster like nineteen thirty-two?
No plan could lead the Nation back faster to such a crisis.

The proposed plan of the Republican leaders is a straight subsidy of unlimited farm production. In a year or two of normal weather, it would pile surplus on top of surplus, driving prices down and down and down. It is the Federal Farm Board all over again, and it is nine cents for corn as it was in nineteen thirty-two.

And, finally, to make the parallel with nineteen thirty-two more deadly, more letter-perfect, the Republican leaders now propose to repeal the Reciprocal Tariff Act, and go back to the old Smoot-Hawley tariff policy. Once again, as in nineteen thirty-two, the farmers would have price-crushing surpluses at home, and no place to sell abroad.

And what about the cost? It would run to one and a half and even possibly two billion dollars every year. That vast sum would be spent not to save agriculture, but to wreck it and with it the Nation.

And remember, my friends, that either this plan which they advocate in the West, or the curtailment of expenditures that they talk about in the East, would have to be discarded. Both promises cannot possibly be carried out at the same time.
For the first time in many cruel years, we are getting the business of farming well in hand. Do you now want to turn over that problem to the care of those who did nothing about it in the past? Do you want to turn it over, do you want to turn it over to those who now make inconsistent promises, campaign-devised promises, half-baked promises and they know they cannot keep them!

It has been said that the administration's farm program changes each year like new models of automobiles. I accept that simile. The automobile of today is the same kind of a vehicle, in principle, as it was twenty years ago. But because the automobile manufacturer, backed by the public, did not hesitate to pioneer—because he was willing to make yearly changes in his model—the Nation now drives a car that is vastly improved—because the farmer has been willing to pioneer—because, with the aid of scientists, economists and engineers, he has been willing, year after year, to change—because of these things both the product of the farms and and the product—business—of farming have been vastly improved. And it is the aim of our policy not only to prevent the return of yesterday's model but to make tomorrow's model better than today's. Good as it was in the old days, we have passed beyond Model T farming.
Our long-time policy of prudence and farm progress includes a program of conservation against land wastage and soil impoverishment. From the beginning, such a program has been basic in our plans. Back in October, October twenty-five, nineteen thirty-five, months after the action of the Supreme Court on the Triple A, I mean months before that action, I said publicly that it was the intention of the framers of that act, as it was my intention, "to pass from the purely emergency phases necessitated by a grave national crisis to a long-time more permanent plan for American agriculture."

We know that our soil had been recklessly impoverished by crops that did not pay. Because we stand committed to a philosophy of continuous plenty, we have set ourselves resolutely against waste—waste that comes from unneeded production—waste that imperils the Nation's future by draining away the abundance with which God has enriched our soil.

Increasing production alone in an unlimited way appeals to no person who thinks the problem through. Increasing consumption must go hand in hand with it. Here's a simple figure to mull over. If every family in the United States had enough money, had enough earning capacity, to live on what the doctors and the dieticians call a
"Class A Diet", we would need foodstuffs from forty-five million acres more than we are using today. America's diet is better than that of most other Nations, but from the point of view of better national health, it is still inadequate. I seek to increase purchasing power so that people can pay for more food and better food, and in turn provide a larger and larger domestic market for the farmer.

And it is a further part of our long-time farm policy to attack the evil of farm tenancy. In this we have already made a good beginning with lower interest rates and better prices. We are preparing legislation, in cooperation with farm leaders, to submit to the Congress in January to help solve this problem. We cannot, as a Nation, be content until we have reached the ultimate objective of every farm family owning its own farm.

And, further, we propose to give to the farmer and to the consumer a sound plan of crop insurance in kind against extreme fluctuations of supply and of price. No one wins from such fluctuations except the speculator. The farmer and the consumer lose together. And that's why— that's why crop insurance is a protection for both, for the farmer and consumer as well. At one and the same time it banishes the consumer's fear of a food shortage and the
farmer's fear of a food surplus. Until both are protected, neither is safe. The ultimate interests of the farmer and the consumer of America are the same.

And that, my friends, is why I am not making one kind of a speech to the farmers out here and another kind of a speech to consumers in the big cities of the East. The same speech and the same policy must go for both.

There's been a lot of education in these last few years. The city dweller has now come to know that unless the farmer receives fair prices for what he produces, he cannot buy the things that are turned out in the shops and the factories of the cities.

And so we plan for the future of agriculture—security for those who have spent their lives in farming—opportunity for real careers for young men and young women on the farms—a share for farmers in the good things of life abundant enough to satisfy and preserve our instinctive faith in the land.

In all our plans we are guided, and will continue to be guided, by the fundamental belief that the American farmer, living on his own land, remains our ideal of self-reliance and of spiritual balance, the source—he is the source from which the reservoirs of the Nation's strength
are constantly renewed. It is from the men and women of our farms—living close to the soil—that this Nation, like the Greek giant Antaeus, touches Mother Earth and rises with strength renewed a hundred-fold.

We want to perpetuate that ideal, we want to perpetuate it under modern conditions, so that men may be strong in the ancient virtues and yet lay hold of the advantages which science and new knowledge offer to a well-rounded life.
Mr. Chairman, Governor Horner, Mayor Kelly, my friends of the great State of Illinois:

I seem to have been here before. Four years ago I dropped into this city from the airways—an old friend come in a new way—to accept in this hall the nomination for the Presidency of the United States. I came to a Chicago fighting with its back to the wall—factories closed, markets silent, banks shaky, ships and trains empty. Today those factories sing the song of industry—markets hum with bustling movement—banks are secure—ships and trains are running full. Once again it is a Chicago that smiles. And with Chicago a whole nation that had not been cheerful for years is full of cheer once more.

On this trip I have talked to farmers, I have talked to miners, I have talked to industrial workers—and in all that I have seen and heard one fact has been clear, clear as crystal—that they are part and parcel of a rounded whole, and that none of them can succeed in their chosen occupations if those in the other occupations fall or fail in their prosperity. I have driven that point home.
And tonight, tonight in this great center of business of the nation, I give the same message to the business men of America, to those who make and sell the processed goods that the Nation uses and to the men and women who work for them.

To them I say:

Do you have a deposit in the bank? It is safer today than it has ever been in our history. It's guaranteed. Last October, last October first marked the end of the first full year in fifty-five years without a single failure of a national bank in the United States. Isn't that on the credit side of the Government's account with you?

Are you an investor? Your stocks and bonds are up to a five or six year high level.

Are you a merchant? Your markets have the precious life-blood of purchasing power. Your customers on the farms have better incomes and smaller debts. Your customers in the cities have more jobs, surer jobs and better jobs. Didn't your Government have something to do with this?

Are you in industry? Industrial earnings, industrial profits are the highest in four, six, or even seven years! Bankruptcies are at a new low. Your Government takes some credit for that.
Are you in—in railroads? Freight loadings are steadily going up and so are passenger receipts because, for one reason, your Government made the railroads cut rates and make money.

Are you a middleman in the great stream of farm products? The meat and the grain that move through your yards and elevators have a steadier supply, a steadier demand and steadier prices than you have known for years. And your Government is trying to keep it that way.

Now, my friends, some people say that all this recovery has just happened. But, but in a complicated modern world, recoveries from depressions do not just happen! The years from nineteen twenty-nine to nineteen thirty-three, when we waited for recovery just to happen, proves the point.

But in nineteen thirty-three, after March fourth, we did not wait. We acted and behind the growing recovery of today is a story of deliberate government acceptance of responsibility, responsibility to save business, to save the American system of private enterprise and economic democracy—a record unequaled by any modern Government in history.

And what had the previous administration in Washington done for four years? Exactly nothing. And why?
For a very fundamental reason. The administration was not industrially-minded, nor agriculturally-minded, nor business-minded. It was high-finance-minded, manned and controlled by a handful of men who in turn controlled, and by one financial device or another took their toll from the greater part of all other business and industry.

But let me make one simple statement. When I refer to high finance I am not talking about all great bankers, or all great corporation executives, or all multi-millionaires, any more than Theodore Roosevelt, in using the term "malefactors of great wealth," implied that all men of great wealth were "malefactors." I do not even imply that the majority of them are bad citizens. The opposite is true.

Just in the same way, the overwhelming majority of business men in this country are good citizens and the proportion of those who are not is probably about the same proportion as in the other occupations and professions of life.

So, when I am speaking of high finance as a harmful factor in recent years, I am speaking about a minority which includes the type of individual who speculates with other people's money—and you in Chicago know the kind I refer to—and I refer also to the type of individual who
says that popular government cannot be trusted and, therefore, that the control of business of all kinds—and, indeed, of government itself—should be vested in the hands of one hundred or two hundred all-wise individuals controlling the purse-strings of the Nation.

High finance of this type refused to permit government credit to go directly to the industrialist, to the business man, to the home-owner, and to the farmer. They wanted it to trickle down from the top, through the intricate arrangements which they controlled and by which they were able to levy tribute on every business in the land.

They did not want interest rates to be reduced by the use of government funds, for that would affect the rate of interest which they themselves wanted to charge. They did not want government supervision over financial exchanges through which they manipulated their monopolies with other people's money.

And in the face of their demands that government do nothing that they called "unsound," the government in those days, hypnotized by its indebtedness to them, stood by and let the depression drive industry and business towards bankruptcy.

Now, my friends, we have discovered something in
the last three and a half years—that America is an economic unit. New means and methods of transportation and communication have made us economically as well as politically a single nation. Let me cite an example. Because kidnappers and bank robbers could in high-powered cars speed across state lines, it became necessary, in order to protect our people, to invoke the power of the Federal Government. And in the same way, in the same way speculators and manipulators from across State lines, and regardless of State laws, have lured the unsuspecting and the unwary to financial destruction. In the same way across State lines, there have been built up intricate corporate structures, piling bond upon stock and stock upon bond—huge monopolies that were stifling independent business and private enterprise.

And there was no power under Heaven that could protect the people against that sort of thing except a people's government at Washington. All that this Administration has done, all that it proposes to do—and this it does propose to do—is to use every power and authority of the Federal Government to protect the commerce of America from the selfish forces that ruined it.

Always, month in and month out, during these three and a half years, your Government has had but one
sign on its desk—"Seek only the greater good of the greater number of Americans." And in appraising the record, remember two things. First, this administration called—this administration was called upon to act after a previous administration and all of the combined forces of private enterprise had failed. And secondly, secondly, in spite of the demand for speed, the complexity of the problem and all the vast sums of money involved, we have had no Teapot Dome.

We found when we came to Washington in nineteen thirty-three, that the business and industry of the Nation were like a train which had gone off the rails into the ditch. Our first job was to get it out of the ditch and start it up the track again as far as the repair shops. And our next job was to repair it—to repair the broken axles that had got it off the road, the engine that had been worn down by gross misuse.

What was it that the average business man wanted Government to do for him—to do immediately in the spring of nineteen thirty-three?

Five things:

Stop deflation and falling prices—and we did it.

Increase the purchasing power of his consumers who were industrial workers in the cities—and we did it.
Increase the purchasing power of his customers on the farms—and we did it.

Decrease the interest rates, the power rates, and the transportation rates—and we did it.

Protect him from losses due to crime, bank robbers, kidnappers, and blackmailers—and we've done it.

And how did we do it? By a sound monetary policy that raised prices. By reorganizing the banks of the Nation and insuring their deposits. By bringing the business men of the Nation together and encouraging them to pay higher wages, to shorten working hours, and to discourage that minority—and to discourage that minority among their own members who were engaging in unfair competition and unethical business practices.

Through the Triple A, through our cattle-buying program, through our program of drought relief and flood relief, through the Farm Credit Administration, we raised the income of the customers of business who lived on the farms. By our program to provide work for the unemployed, by our CCC camps, and other measures, greater purchasing power was given to those who lived in the cities.

Money began to go round again. The dollars paid out by government were spent in the stores and shops of the Nation; and spent, spent again to the wholesaler; and spent
again to the factory; and spent again to the wage earner; and then spent again in another store and shop. The wheels of business began to turn again; the train was back on the rails.

And, mind you, that train did not get out of the ditch itself, it was pulled out by the government.

And we hauled it along the road. PWA, WPA, both provided normal and useful employment for hundreds of thousands of workers. Hundreds of millions of dollars got into circulation when we liquidated the assets of closed banks through the RFC; millions more when we loaned money for home building and home financing through the Federal Housing program; hundreds of millions—hundreds of millions more in loans and grants to enable municipalities to build needed improvements; hundreds of millions more through the CCC camps.

I am not going to talk to you tonight about how much our program to provide work for the unemployed has meant to the Nation as a whole. That cannot be measured in dollars and cents. It can be measured only in terms of the preservation of the families of America.

But so far as business goes, it can be measured in terms of sales made and goods moving.

The train of American business is moving ahead.
You people know what I mean when I say it was clear that if the train is to run smoothly again the cars will have to be loaded more evenly. We have made a definite start in getting the train loaded more evenly, in order that axles may not break again.

For example, we have provided a sounder and cheaper money market and a sound banking and securities system. You business men know how much legitimate business you lost in the old days because your customers were robbed by fake securities or impoverished or shaky banks.

By our monetary policy we've kept prices up and lightened the burden of debt. It's easier to get credit, and it's easier to repay what you have borrowed.

We have encouraged cheaper power for the small factory owner to lower his cost of production.

We have given the business man cheaper transportation rates.

But, above all, we have fought to break the deadly grip which monopoly in the past has been able to fasten on the business of the nation.

Because we cherished our system of private property and free enterprise and because we were determined to preserve it as the foundation of our traditional American system, we recalled the warning of Thomas Jefferson that
"widespread poverty and concentrated wealth cannot long endure side by side in a democracy."

And so our job was to preserve the American ideal of economic as well as political democracy, against the abuse of concentration of economic power that had been insidiously growing up among us in the last fifty years, particularly during the twelve years of preceding administrations. Free economic enterprise was being weeded out at an alarming pace.

During those years of false prosperity, you and I know that one business after another, one small corporation after another, their resources depleted, had failed or had fallen into the lap of a bigger competitor.

A dangerous thing was happening. More than half of the corporate wealth of the country had come under the control of less than two hundred big corporations. That is not all. These huge corporations in some cases did not even try to compete with each other. They themselves were tied together by interlocking directors, interlocking bankers, and interlocking lawyers.

This concentration of wealth and power has been built upon other people's money, other people's business, other people's labor. Under the concentration independent business was allowed to exist only by sufferance. It has
been a menace to the social system as well as to the
economic system that we call American Democracy.

As a matter of practical fact, there is no excuse
for it in the cold terms of industrial efficiency.

There is no excuse for it from the point of
view of the average investor.

There is no excuse for it from the point of view
of the independent business man.

I believe, and I've always believed, and I
always will believe in private enterprise as the backbone
of economic well-being in the United States.

But I know, and you know, and every independent
business man who has had to struggle against the competition
of monopolies knows, that this concentration of economic
power in all-embracing corporations does not represent
private enterprise as we Americans cherish it and propose
to foster it. On the contrary, it represents private
enterprise which has become a kind of private government,
and is a power unto itself—a regimentation of other
people's money and other people's lives.

Back in Kansas, back in Kansas I spoke about
bogeymen and fairy tales which the real Republican leaders,
many of whom are part of this concentrated power, are
using to spread fear among the American people.
But you good people have heard about these fairy tales and bogeymen too. You have heard about how antagonistic to business this Administration is supposed to be. You have heard all about the dangers which the business of America is supposed to be facing if this Administration continues.

My friends, the answer to that is the record of what we have done. It was this Administration which saved the system of private profit, the system of free enterprise after it had been dragged to the brink of ruin by these same leaders who now try to scare you.

Look at the advance in private business in the last three and a half years; and read there what we think about private business.

Today for the first time in seven years the banker, the storekeeper, the small factory owner, the industrialist, can all sit back and enjoy the company of their own ledgers. They're in the black. And that's where we want them to be; that is where our policies aim that they shall be; and that is where we intend them to be in the days to come.

Some of these people really forget how sick they were. But I know how sick they were. I have their fever charts. I know how the knees of all of our rugged
individualists were trembling four years ago and how their hearts fluttered. They came to Washington in great numbers. Washington did not look like a dangerous bureaucracy to them then. No, it looked like an emergency hospital. And all of these distinguished patients wanted two things—a quick hypodermic to end the pain, and they wanted a course of treatment to cure the disease. They wanted them in a hurry and we gave them both. And now, my friends, most of the patients seem to be doing very nicely. Some of them are even well enough to throw their crutches at the doctor.

I believe in individualism. I believe in it in the arts, the sciences and professions. I believe in it in business. I believe in individualism in all these things—up to the point where the individualist starts to operate at the expense of society. And the overwhelming majority of American business men do not believe in it beyond that point. We have all suffered in the past from individualism run wild—society has suffered and business has suffered.

And so, believing in the solvency of business, the solvency of farmers and the solvency of workers, I believe also in the solvency of Government. Your Government is solvent.

The net Federal debt today is lower in proportion
to the income of the Nation and in proportion to the wealth of the Nation than it was on March fourth, nineteen thirty-three.

And in the future it will become lower still because with the rising tide of national income and national wealth, the very causes of our emergency spending are starting to disappear. Government expenditures are coming down and Government income is going up. And so, my friends, the opportunities for private enterprise will continue to expand.

The people of America have no quarrel with business. They insist only that the power of concentrated wealth shall not be abused.

We have come through a hard struggle to preserve democracy in America. Where other Nations in other parts of the world have lost that fight, we have won it.

The business men of America and all other citizens have joined in a firm resolve to hold the fruits of that victory—to cling to the old ideals, to cling to the old fundamentals upon which America has grown great.
Senator Walsh, Governor Curley, Mayor Sullivan, and my friends of New England:

It has taken only one day of driving through Rhode Island and Massachusetts to prove to me that New England is in step, and on November third will be in step with the rest of the Nation.

I have seen things today even more welcome to me than your lovely autumn foliage. I have seen the smoke from factories—which three and a half years ago were smokeless. I have heard the sound of mills which were silent. I have seen men at work who were jobless. I have seen women and children who, after long years of fear, have begun to live and hope again.

Three and a half years ago we declared war on the depression. And you and I know today that that war is being won.

But now comes—-but now comes that familiar figure—-the well-upholstered hindsight critic. He tells us that our strategy was wrong—-that the cost was too great—-that something else won the war. That is an
argument as old as the remorse of those who had their chance and muffed it. It is as recent as the claims of those who say that they could have done better.

You remember the First Battle of the Marne in the autumn of nineteen fourteen. Almost everybody thought that it was Marshal Joffre had won it. But some refused to agree and one day a newspaperman appealed to Marshal Joffre, and said, "Will you tell me who did win the Battle of the Marne?" "I can't answer that," said Joffre, "but I can tell you that if the Battle of the Marne had been lost the blame would have been on me."

Our war, too--this war that we're finishing--had to be won. No price, we were told then, was too high to pay to win it. We did count the cost. But in the barrage that we laid down against the depression we could not stop firing to haggle about the price of every shell. We kept on firing and fighting. The important thing is that the war is being won.

And without that victory we cannot have the kind of America we know and love and want our children to live in.

New England--as one of the senior partners in the company of the states--has always stood for two of the fundamentals of American liberty--the Town Meeting, with its essential insistence on local control over local
affairs—and the doctrine for which Sam Adams fought with his friends, Sam Adams and his friends, the doctrine of democracy in taxation. And while I do not happen to be a cousin of the distinguished Adams family, I consider myself, politically, a lineal descendant of old Sam.

And in seventeen seventy-six the fight was for democracy in taxation. In nineteen thirty-six that is still the fight. Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said: "Taxes are the prices we pay for civilized society." One sure way to determine the social conscience of a government is to examine the way taxes are collected and how they are spent. And one sure way to determine the social conscience of an individual is to get his tax-reaction.

Taxes, after all, are the dues that we pay for the privileges of membership in an organized society.

And as society becomes more civilized, government--national and state and local--is called on to assume more obligations to its citizens. The privileges of membership in a civilized society have vastly increased in modern times. But I am afraid we have many who still do not recognize their advantages and want to avoid paying their dues.

It is only in the past two generations that most local communities have paved and lighted their streets, put
in town sewers, provided town water supplies, organized fire departments, established high schools and public libraries, created parks and playgrounds—undertaken, in short, all kinds of necessary new activities which, perforce, had to be paid for out of local taxes.

And let me at this point note that in this most amazing of campaigns, I've found sections of the Nation where Republican leaders were actually whispering the word to the owners of homes and farms that the present Federal Administration proposed to make a cash levy on local real estate to pay off the national debt. They know, they know and the people as a whole know that the Federal Government does not tax real estate—they know, or ought to know that it cannot tax real estate. If they do not know that, I suggest they read the Constitution of the United States to find out.

New obligations to their citizens have also been assumed by the several states and by the Federal Government—obligations that were unknown a century and a half ago that were made necessary by new inventions and by a constantly growing social conscience.

The easiest way to summarize the reason for this extension of government functions—local and state and federal—is to use the words of Abraham Lincoln: "The
legitimate object of government," he said, "is to do for the people what needs to be done but which they cannot by individual effort do at all, or do so well, for themselves."

And so, my friends, taxes are the price that we all pay collectively to get those things done.

To divide fairly among the people the obligation to pay for these benefits has been a major part of our struggle to maintain democracy in America.

Ever since seventeen seventy-six that struggle has been between two forces. On the one hand, there has been a vast majority of citizens who believed that the benefits of democracy should be extended and who were willing to pay their fair share to extend them. And, on the other hand, there has been a small, but powerful, group which has fought the extension of those benefits, because it did not want to pay a fair share of their cost.

That was the line-up in seventeen hundred and seventy-six. And it's the line-up today. And I am confident that once more—in nineteen thirty-six—democracy in taxation will win.

Here is my principle and I think it's yours too:
taxes shall be levied according to ability to pay. That is the only American principle.

Before this great war, this war against the depression we fought the World War; and it cost us twenty-five billion dollars in three years to win it. We borrowed to fight that war. Then, as now, in nineteen seventeen and eighteen and nineteen, a Democratic Administration provided sufficient taxes to pay off the entire war debt within ten or fifteen years.

Those taxes in the war days had been levied according to ability to pay. But the succeeding Republican Administration did not believe in that principle. And there was a reason. They had political debts, to those who sat at their elbows. To pay those political debts, they reduced the taxes of their friends in the higher brackets and left the national debt to be paid by later generations. Because they regarded the political debt as more important than the national debt, the depression of nineteen twenty-nine started in with a sixteen billion dollar handicap on us and our children.

Now let's keep this little drama straight. The actors are the same. But the act is different. Today their role calls for stage tears about the next generation. But, in the days after the World War, they played a different part.
And the moral of the play is clear. They got out from under them—they would get out from under now—if their friends could get back into power and they could get back to the driver's seat. But neither you nor I think that they are going to get back.

But, as in the World War, we have again created a tax structure to yield revenues adequate to pay the cost of this war against the depression in this generation and not in the next.

New or increased taxes are not needed to enable us to balance the Federal Budget and to begin very soon a rapid reduction in the national debt. Why? Because recovery is with us. Federal revenues are increasing; emergency expenditures are decreasing. A balanced budget is on the way. Does that sound like bankruptcy to you?

Keep on. Why this increase in government revenues? Because the taxpayer earns more money and spends more money. And, though he pays more money in taxes, he has more money left for himself and his family.

And here are some very simple and very interesting figures. For the average American, we have reduced the individual income tax. Any family head who earns an income of less than twenty-six thousand dollars a year pays a smaller income tax in nineteen thirty-six
than in nineteen thirty-two. Now that means that less than one per cent of the heads of American families are paying today more than they did; and more than ninety-nine per cent of American families are paying less than they did, because more than ninety-nine per cent of American families earn less than twenty-six thousand dollars a year. And if you want the answer to this talk about high taxes under this administration--there it is. Taxes are higher for less than one per cent who can afford to pay high taxes. And they are lower for those who can afford to pay less. That's getting back to the American principle--taxation according to ability to pay.

But you would think, to hear some people talk, that those good people who live at the top of our economic pyramid are being taxed into rags and tatters. But what is the fact? The fact is that they are much further away from the poorhouse than they were in nineteen thirty-two. And you and I know that as a matter of personal observation.

A number of my friends who belong in these very high upper brackets have suggested to me on several occasions, have suggested more in sorrow than in anger, that, if I am reelected President, they will have to move to some other nation because of high taxes here. Now, I
will miss them very much, but if they do go they will soon come back. Because a year or two of paying taxes in almost any other country in the world will make them yearn once more for the good old taxes of the U.S.A.

One more word on--on recent history. I inherited from the previous administration a tax structure which not only imposed an unfair income tax burden on the low-income groups of this country, but it also imposed an unfair burden on the average American by a long list of taxes on purchases and consumption--in other words, what we call hidden taxes.

In nineteen thirty-three when we came into office, fifty-eight cents out of every dollar of Federal revenue came from hidden taxes. Leaving out of account the liquor tax--because liquor was illegal when I came into office--leaving out that tax--that's a hidden tax, we have reduced those indirect taxes to thirty-eight cents out of every dollar.

How else have we improved and Americanized the tax structure?

First, we gave a credit to earned income--that is, income from personal work or service--thus substantially reducing taxes paid by the working citizen. Wasn't that the American thing to do?
Secondly, we decreased the tax rates on small corporations. Wasn’t that the American thing to do?

And, third, we increased the taxes paid by individuals in the higher brackets—those with incomes of over fifty thousand dollars a year. Wasn’t that the American thing to do?

Fourth, we increased still further, more steeply, the taxes paid by individuals in the highest brackets of all—men and women with incomes of one million dollars a year and up. Wasn’t that the American thing to do?

Fifth, we increased the tax on very large estates. Wasn’t that the American thing to do?

And, finally, this year we had to find new revenues to meet the immediate bonus payments and to take the place of the processing taxes. And this new tax—called the undistributed profits tax—is merely an extension of the individual income tax law and a plugging-up of the loopholes in it—loopholes, incidentally, that could only be used by people with very large incomes.

I want to say a word to you average investors and stock—stockholders who are being flooded by propaganda about this tax—propaganda, incidentally, that’s being paid with your money. It’s being disseminated by
those who have used corporations in the past to build up their own economic power, who seek, by holding back your dividends, to keep down your taxes.

It is a fact that ninety-eight and a half per cent of all American corporations will pay a smaller normal corporation tax under the new law than under the old.

And it is a fact that the law permits corporations to expand and build up adequate reserves.

But, my friends, for the first time it gives the stockholder a practical chance to determine for himself whether to keep his earnings in the corporation for expansion purposes or to take them out. He is now the one—not the management, not the board of directors—he is now the one to choose between using his dividends for something else or reinvesting them in the stock of the corporation.

What we are concerned about—not only people who have no stocks and bonds but everybody who has ownership of stocks and bonds—what we're concerned about primarily is principle, and the principle of this law is sound. If, in its application, imperfections are discovered, they must be corrected for the good of American business, just like imperfections in any other statute of
the Federal Government or the state or the locality.

I am certain that the average of our citizenship
is not taken in by the amazing amount of other tax
misinformation which has been turned loose in this
political campaign.

People tell you that there are fifty-eight taxes
on a loaf of bread, or sixty-three taxes on a lady’s coat.
But, my friends, stop, look and listen. You will find
what the propagandists do not tell you—that only two or
three of all of them are Federal taxes imposed by the
national government. All the rest are imposed by local,
town, county, city, district and state governments. And
remember that two-thirds of all the taxes paid in America
are state and local taxes, and not Federal taxes.

And this administration has had something to do
with these local taxes. It has made them easier to bear.
At the request of local and state governments for whom
the local burden had become too heavy, we in Washington
assumed the cost of paying in greater part for work for
the needy unemployed. And, by a national fiscal policy
aimed at reducing interest rates throughout the nation, we
have greatly lightened the burden of carrying local
government debts, helping those of you who own homes or
farms or who pay rent.
And I want to say a word, a word also to the wage earners who are finding propaganda about the security tax in their pay envelopes. I want to remind them that the new social security law was designed for them—for the greater safety of their homes and their families. The fund necessary to provide that security is not collected solely from workers. The employer, too, pays an equal share. And both shares—yours and the employer's—are being held for the sole benefit of the worker himself.

I have spoken in Chicago and elsewhere of the simple fact that the overwhelming majority of business men are like the rest of us. Most of us—whether we earn wages, run farms or run businesses—are in one sense business men. All they seek and all we seek is fair play based on the greater good of the greater number—fair play on the part of government in levying taxes on us and fair play on the part of government in protecting us against abuses.

Once more this year we must choose between democracy in taxation and special privilege in taxation. Are you willing to turn the control of the nation's taxes back to special privilege? I know, and you know, the American answer to that question. Your pay envelope may be loaded with suggestions of fear, and your dividend
letter may be filled with propaganda. But the American people will neither be bluffed nor bludgeoned.

The seeds of fear cannot bear fruit in the polling booth.

Inside the polling booth every American man and every American woman stands as the equal of every other American man and woman. There they have no superiors. There they have no masters. There they have nobody telling them what to do save their own minds, save their own consciences. There they are sovereign American citizens. And there on November third they will not fear to exercise that sovereignty.
Speech No. 7

Address at Madison Square Garden,
New York City, October 31, 1936

Senator Wagner, Governor Lehman, my friends:

On the eve of a national election, it is well for us to stop for a moment and analyze calmly and without prejudice the effect on our nation of a victory by either of the major political parties.

The problem of the electorate is far deeper, far more vital than the continuance in the Presidency of any individual. The greater issue—the greater issue goes—goes beyond units of humanity—it goes to humanity itself.

In nineteen thirty-two the issue was the restoration of American democracy; and the American people were in a mood to win. They did win. And in nineteen thirty-six the issue is the preservation of their victory. Again they are in a mood to win. And again they will win.

More than four years ago in accepting the Democratic nomination in Chicago, I said: "Give me your help not to win votes alone, but to win in this crusade to restore America to its own people."

And we know tonight that the banners of that
crusade still fly in the forefront of a nation that is still on the march.

It is needless to repeat the details of the program which this administration has been hammering out on the anvils of experience. No amount of misrepresentation or statistical contortion can conceal or blur or smear that record. Neither the attacks of unscrupulous enemies nor the exaggerations of over-zealous friends will serve to mislead our people.

Just what was our hope in nineteen thirty-two? Above all other things the American people wanted peace. They wanted peace of mind instead of gnawing fear.

First, first they sought escape from the personal terror that had stalked them for three years. They wanted the peace that comes from security in their homes--safety for their savings--permanence in their jobs--and a fair profit from their enterprise.

Next, they wanted peace in the community, the peace that springs from the ability to meet the needs of community life--schools, playgrounds, parks, sanitation, highways--those things which are expected of solvent local government. They sought escape from the disintegration and the bankruptcy of local and state affairs.

And they sought also peace within the nation--
protection of their currency, fairer wages, the ending of long hours of toil, the abolition of child labor, the elimination of wild-cat speculation, and the safety of their children from kidnappers.

And, finally, they sought peace with other nations—peace in a world of unrest. The nation knows that I hate war. And—and I know that the nation hates war.

And so I submit to you a record of peace; and on that record a well-founded expectation for future peace—peace for the individual, peace for the community, peace for the nation, and peace with the world.

Tonight I call the roll—the roll of honor of those who stood with us in nineteen thirty-two and still stand with us today.

Written on that roll of honor are the names of millions who never had a chance—men at starvation wages, women in sweatshops, children at looms.

Written on it are the names of those who despaired—young men, young women for whom opportunity had become a will-o-the-wisp.

Written on it are the names of farmers whose acres yielded only bitterness, business men whose books were portents of disaster, home owners who were faced with eviction, frugal citizens whose savings were insecure.
Written there in large letters are the names of countless other Americans of all parties and all faiths--Americans who had eyes to see and hearts to understand--whose consciences were burdened because too many of their fellow beings were burdened--who looked on these things four years ago and said, "This can be changed. We will change it."

We still lead that army in nineteen thirty-six. They stood with us then, in nineteen thirty-two, because they believed. They stand with us today, in nineteen thirty-six because they know. And with them, with them stand millions, yes, with them stand millions of new recruits who have come to know.

Their hopes have become our record.

We have not come thus far without a struggle and I assure you that we cannot go further without a struggle.

For twelve years our nation was afflicted with hear-nothing, see-nothing, do-nothing government. The nation, the nation looked to that government but that government looked away. Nine mocking years with the golden calf and three long years of the scourge! Nine crazy years at the ticker and three long years in the breadlines! Nine mad years of mirage and three long years of despair! And, my friends, powerful influences strive
today to restore that kind of government with its doctrine that that government is best which is most indifferent to mankind.

For nearly four years now you have had an administration which, instead of twirling its thumbs, has rolled up its sleeves. And I can assure you that we will keep our sleeves rolled up.

We had to struggle with the old enemies of peace—business and financial monopoly, speculation, reckless banking, class antagonism, sectionalism, war profiteering.

They had begun to consider the government of the United States as a mere appendage to their own affairs. And we know now that government by organized money is just as dangerous as government by organized mob.

Never before in all our history have these forces been so united against one candidate as they stand today. They are unanimous in their hate for me—and I welcome their hatred.

I should like to have it said of my first administration that in it the forces of selfishness and of lust for power met their match. I should like to have it said—wait a minute—I should like to have it said of
my second administration that in it these forces met their master.

And, my friends—and, my friends, the American people know from a four-year record that today there is only one entrance to the White House, and that's by the front door. Since March fourth, nineteen thirty-three, there has been only one passkey to the White House. And I have carried that key in my own pocket. It's there tonight. And, so long as I'm president, it's going to remain in my pocket.

But those who used to have passkeys are not happy. Some of them, indeed, are desperate. Only desperate men with their backs to the wall would descend so far below the level of decent citizenship as to foster the current pay-envelope campaign against America's working people. Only reckless men, heedless of consequences, would risk the disruption of the hope for a new peace between worker and employer by returning to the tactics of the labor spy.

And here is an amazing—here is an amazing paradox! The very employers and politicians and newspapers who talk most loudly of class antagonism and the destruction of the American system now undermine that system by this attempt to coerce the votes of the wage
earners of the country. It is the nineteen thirty-six version of the old threat to close down the factory or the office if a particular candidate does not win. It is the old strategy of tyrants to delude their victims into fighting their battles for them.

Every message in a pay envelope, even if it is the truth, is a command to vote according to the will of the employer. But this propaganda is worse—it is deceit.

They tell the worker that his wage will be reduced by a contribution to some vague form of old-age insurance. But they carefully conceal from him the fact that for every dollar of premium he pays for that insurance, the employer pays another dollar. And that omission, in itself, is deceit.

They carefully conceal from him the fact that under the federal law, he receives another insurance policy to help him if he loses his job, and that the premium of that policy is paid one hundred percent by the employer and not one cent by the worker. But they do not tell him that the insurance policy that is bought for him is far more favorable to him than any policy that any private insurance company could possibly afford to issue. And that omission is deceit.
They imply to him that he pays all the cost of both forms of insurance. They carefully conceal from him the fact that for every dollar put up by him his employer puts up three dollars—three for one. And that omission is deceit.

But they are guilty of more than deceit. When they imply that the reserves thus created against both these policies will be stolen by some future Congress—diverted to some wholly foreign purpose—they attack the integrity and the honor of American government itself. Those who suggest that are already aliens to the spirit of American democracy. Let them—let them emigrate and try their lot under some foreign flag in which they have more confidence.

And, and the fraudulent nature of this attempt is well shown by the record of votes on the passage of the Social Security Act. In addition to an overwhelming majority of Democrats in both houses, seventy-seven Republican Representatives voted for it and only eighteen against it, and fifteen Republican Senators voted for it and only five against it. Where, where does this last-minute drive of the Republican leadership leave these Republican Representatives and Senators who helped to enact the law?
I am sure that the vast majority of law-abiding business men who are not parties to this propaganda fully appreciate the extent of the threat to honest business contained in this coercion.

I have expressed indignation at this form of campaigning, and I am confident that the overwhelming majority of employers and workers and the general public share that indignation and will show it at the polls on Tuesday next.

But, aside from this phase of it, I prefer to remember this campaign not as bitter but only as hard-fought. There should be no bitterness or hate where the sole thought is the welfare of the United States of America. No man can occupy the office of President without realizing that he is President of all the people.

And it is because I have sought to think in terms of the whole nation that I am confident that today, just as four years ago, the people want more than promises.

And our vision for the future contains more than promises.

This is our answer to those who, silent about their own plans, ask us to state our objectives.

Of course, of course, we will continue to seek
to improve working conditions for the workers of America, to reduce hours that are overlong, to increase wages that spell starvation, to end the labor of children, and to wipe out sweatshops. Of course, we will continue every effort to end monopoly in business, to support collective bargaining, to stop unfair competition, and to abolish dishonorable trade practices. And for all these we have only just begun to fight.

Of course, we will continue our efforts in behalf of the farmers of America. With their continued cooperation we will do all in our power to end up the piled—to end the piling up of huge surpluses which spelled ruinous prices for their crops. We will persist in successful action for better land use, for reforestation, for the conservation of water all the way from its source to the sea, for drought control and flood control, for better marketing facilities for farm commodities, for a reduction of farm tenancy, for encouragement of farm cooperatives, for crop insurance and for a stable food supply for the nation. And for all these too we have only just begun to fight.

Of course, we will provide useful work for the needy unemployed, because we prefer useful work to the pauperism of a dole.
And here and now I want to make myself clear about those who disparage their fellow citizens on the relief rolls. They say that those on relief are not merely jobless, they say that they are worthless. Their solution for the relief problem is to end relief—to purge the rolls by starvation. To use the language of the stock broker, our needy unemployed would be cared for when, as, and if, some fairy godmother should happen to come on the scene.

But you and I will continue to refuse to accept that estimate of our unemployed fellow Americans. Your government is still on the same side of the street with the Good Samaritan and not with those who pass by on the other side.

To go on—what of our objectives?

Of course, we will continue our efforts for young men and women so that they may obtain an education and an opportunity to put it to use. Of course, we will continue our help for the crippled, for the blind, for the mothers—our insurance for the unemployed—our security for the aged.

Of course, we will continue to protect the consumer against unnecessary price spreads, against the costs that are added by monopoly and speculation. We will continue our successful efforts to increase his purchasing
power and keep it constant. And for these things too, and
for a multitude of things like them, we have only just
begun to fight.

All this—all these objectives—spell peace at
home. All our actions, all our ideals, spell also peace
with other nations.

Today there is war and rumor of war. We want
none of it. But while we guard our shores against threats
of war, we will continue to remove the causes of unrest
and antagonism at home which might make our people more
easy victims to those for whom foreign war is profitable.
And, and note well that those who stand to profit by war
are not on our side in this campaign.

"Peace on earth, good will toward men"—
democracy must cling to that message. For it is my very
deep conviction that democracy cannot live without that
true religion which gives a nation a sense of justice and
of moral purpose. Above our political forums, above our
market places stand the altars of our faith—altars on which
burn the fires of devotion that maintain all that is best
in us and all that is best in our nation.

We have need of that devotion today. It is that
which makes it possible for government to persuade those
who are mentally prepared to fight each other to go on
instead, to work for and to sacrifice for each other. And this is why we need to say with the old prophet—"What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God." That is why the recovery we seek, the recovery we are winning, is more than economic. In it are included justice and love and humility, not for ourselves as individuals alone, but for our nation. And that, that is the road to peace.
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